THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VII JULY, 1923 No. 37

EDITORIAL

THE CATHOLIC MOVEMENT

This month the Anglo-Catholic Congress in London will celebrate the ninetieth anniversary of Keble's Assize Sermon; and we should belie our sub-title as a Journal of Historic Christianity if we did not say something of the remarkable spiritual movement which is commonly dated from that event. Distinction is sometimes made—and rightly—between the "Oxford Movement," which was mainly academic in its appeal, and the "Catholic Movement," which applied the standards recovered by the scholars to the practical and pastoral work of the Church in the parishes. But to-day these two elements in the movement have so closely re-acted upon one another, and both have ramified so widely in the Church's life, both at home and abroad, that the distinction has little more than historical value. When we think of the movement, we think indifferently of Pusey and Mackonochie, of Keble and Bishop Steer, of Illingworth, Gore, and Arthur Stanton. What the Victorian Age saw growing from infancy to sturdy youth and maturity was a single spiritual entity—the Catholic Church as this Church and Realm have received it.

Naturally the parish priests got the hardest knocks, because changes of practice are more disagreeable, at least to a practical people like our own, than changes of idea. But both pastor and scholar had one sheet-anchor which stood firm through the storm. That sheet-anchor was the Prayer Book. The first two generations of the movement were fighting above all for the truth of the Prayer Book. They asserted that its title, its rubrics, its calendar, its offices, its liturgy, its catechism, its ordinal proclaimed it to be a Catholic book. And few to-day would deny that they won their case, and won it so demonstrably in scholarship as to secure at last the recognition of

law. It cannot be too often remembered that but for the Prayer Book the movement could never have made headway without a schism. As it was, it could claim that it had Anglican formularies on its side; and the claim was one that was, and is, convincing as much to the laity as to the clergy.

That firm basis of recovered standards is what underlies the theological tradition which has been one of the glories of the movement. What are the notes of that tradition? First and foremost we should set its continuous witness to the truth of Supernatural Religion. This is the common root of Pusey's devoted study of the Prophets; of Liddon's impassioned preaching of the Incarnation; of Gore's vindication of the Divine character of the Church and Ministry; of Illingworth's exposition of God's relation to the world; of Church's haunting sermons; of Paget's moral teaching. For all of them the Catholic Faith has the same rich and abiding content, the same sufficiency for every vicissitude of life and thought. And the Gospel so resoundingly set forth won the hearts of the ablest men of their generation. Gladstone brought to its cause his uniquely versatile genius, Shorthouse and Charlotte Yonge their gifts as novelists, Keble and Christina Rossetti—and should we not add Browning?—their poetry, Cowper, Burne-Jones, Richmond the skill of architect and artist. And only a *coherent* Faith could do this. What has held the Catholic movement together has not been (as its detractors sometimes say) its organization: that has been the fruit, not the cause, of agreement. The real cement has been, and is, the one Spirit of God revealing the intrinsic and rational unity of His whole counsel declared in Christ and by His Apostles, and commending it to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

This hold upon the living Christ and the present activity of His Spirit enabled the movement to meet with conspicuous success three storms—a veritable τρικυμιά of controversy—that fell upon English Christianity in the nineteenth century. The first was the Higher Criticism, where rusty and antiquated doctrines of Inspiration seemed to commit the Church to obscurantism. Catholic theology, while refusing to surrender any vital points, was prepared by its belief in the Spirit-filled community to give full value to the human element behind the inspired Scriptures; and many dismayed souls rejoiced to realize that not in the Bible only, but in the Bible and the Church together, was the seat of religious authority. The second was the general development of science, and especially of the Science of Religions, which promised (as Renan

boasted) to "explain Christianity away" by the discovery of similar ideas and rites in heathen cults. But this point again had no terrors for those who had learnt how the "Præparatio Evangelica" included (as *Lux Mundi* taught, following St. Paul) not Jewry alone, but the pagan world as well. The third was the ever-stirring challenge of the Social Movement, voiced so powerfully by Kingsley and the Christian Socialists; and here it was the devoted labours of the "Ritualist" clergy, living among the poor rather than talking about them, that demonstrated in reality and power the social implicates of the Incarnation.

For the movement has been even more pastoral than theological. It brought into the work of the Ministry new hopes and ambitions, and broadened the whole idea of vocation. The diversity of function so characteristic of the Pauline conception of the Church became a fact. Perhaps the most striking symptom of this has been the growth—surely unparallelled in history—of Religious Houses. What provision would there be for intensive evangelistic work in the Church without Cowley or Mirfield or Wantage? What for the contemplative life without Pershore or Malling or the Order of St. Anne? What for the training of the sons of artisans for the priesthood without Kelham? And to these must be added a host of dedicated lives, some under vows, others not, which have brought the love of God into dark and sorrowful places. And the effect has been to quicken the pulse of the whole Church. Retreats, once the suspected privilege of a few, have become habitual for thousands of men and women, rich and poor; and numberless souls have found in the habits and methods of devotion the sweetest task of their lives.

All this, we repeat, has been done on the basis of the Prayer Book. This does not mean that revision is not to be welcomed and worked for. We stress it rather for another reason. We believe that the movement has commanded the confidence of men and women of fine calibre just because it could and did take its stand upon the impregnable rock of lawful authority. The strength and solid, enduring work of men like Father Benson, Founder of S.S.J.E., were due to the fact that they knew just where they stood, and let everyone else know too: and thus they drew men after them. They had precisely the same suspicion of emotionalism as the prelates of the eighteenth century, and appraised at its true value the meaning of numbers. They realized what the Bishop of Bloemfontein has lately pointed out with such force*—viz., that the Ministry of the Word not

* *Conversion, Catholicism, and the English Church*, Mowbray. 1923. 2s. net.

only precedes that of the Sacraments as its ground and preparation, but must always keep ahead of it on peril of grave spiritual loss; and that the standard both of teaching and practice was to be found in the formularies of the English Church. In other words, they were at once Catholic and Anglican.

It is out of such a seed-plot that the present post-war Anglo-Catholic movement has burst into efflorescence. It is important to recognize that this last phase is essentially *prophetic*. We have not simply a continuation of earlier tradition; there has been a real re-association of elements, and the entry of fresh elements, under a new inspiration. Two or three factors in particular seem to us to have affected and enlarged the movement in the last ten years, all more or less connected with the war.

1. The democratic movement, of which the great extension of the franchise during the war was symptomatic, released elemental psychic forces which had been but little affected by the discipline and traditions of the English Church; and spiritual leadership fell naturally to those who knew their own minds and went ahead. There was a cry for the spiritual bread that comes down from heaven. The mind's hunger for guidance silences its critical faculty; and the Anglo-Catholic Congress and the Lambeth Conference of 1920 had, perhaps, the most amazing audience in the history of mankind. At that moment the world was a whispering-gallery, and men listened for the voice of God. And they caught its accents—the accents of truth, pardon, power, liberty—in the message of those assemblies.

2. The Catholic movement was the only element in Christendom which was prepared by the whole of its past history to feel the immediate force of the Reunion appeal and to translate it into action. That is a bold statement, but we believe it to be true. The Lambeth Conference based its appeal on two principles, which had always underlain the Catholic movement—viz., Unity of Faith and Order, and Diversity of Jurisdiction. The Evangelicals could welcome it, but not to much purpose; for those with whom their affinities lay had only the vaguest conception of the idea of One visible Church, if, indeed, like Dr. Glover in the *British Weekly*, they did not actually deny it. Rome, again, could not in a moment depart from that habit of mind which for generations past had only thought of Reunion in terms of "submission." And the East was still much encumbered with its own terrible plight. But Catholics of the English Church were ready. Groups or individuals might cavil at details; but as a whole it was felt in the movement that they were particularly the instrument of God's will.

3. The notion of Progress prevalent in the Edwardian

era was shattered by the war, and the result was a disillusionment extending both to the Liberal Protestantism and to the Materialism which had been its main pillars. Bereavement, moreover, tended to fill the void so created with belief in a spiritual world. A Gospel which told how the energies of that world had broken through into this and how the Kingdom of Heaven was already amongst us in the Church, its real though not exhaustive expression, was bound to meet willing ears.

The second of these causes is the one that offers, perhaps, the greatest promise and the greatest dangers. Its immediate effect was to stimulate an admiration for Roman methods and habits of thought, which led to a riot of uncritical imitation. The extravagance of much that was—and still is—done should not blind us to the fact that some of these methods have had great success on the Continent, and fall well within the ample field of Anglican principle. But, that said, it should be remembered that the real issues between Romans and Anglicans concern matters of Faith and Jurisdiction, and that in those spheres the witness of the Eastern Church is of peculiar importance. Happily, recent events make it increasingly certain that this will not be forgotten.

As concerns the Church at home, the Catholic movement is in the throes of answering the very crucial question, *Quo Vadis?* "To Rome," say some, "and the sooner the better"; but they are a tiny fraction. "To the Church of the future," say others; and they are numerous. "To the people of England," say yet others again; and for many the tocsin seems to sound. And our own answer is not dissimilar. Yet it is more limited. We believe that the future lies with the Catholic movement, but on one condition—that men keep to their work. The battle was not won in the Victorian Age by organization or committees, or even congresses and conventions: it was won by "patient continuance in well-doing" on the part of multitudes whose names were written nowhere but in the Book of Life. *Quo Vadis?* is the question. "Back to the parishes," we submit, is the right answer. "Back to the pulpit and the altar, to the school, to the house of the layman and his family. Back to the study and the book-shelf. Back to the Word of God." For we are convinced that the strength of the Catholic movement lies, not in its organization, but in the pastoral love and thoroughness which it has engendered. Parties there must be, and groups and societies within parties; but these things are vain unless they are broad-based upon the experience of workaday people and in touch with the nation's soul.

Next, we will venture to point to two perils of religion that we need to beware of. One is *Archaism*. We mean the habit of mind that is always harking back to tradition, and prefers a musty and disputable precedent to an intelligible reason;—which bases the claim to reserve the Blessed Sacrament, for instance, not on the needs of the sick, but on a constitution of Archbishop Peccham, or even on the Submission of Clergy Act of 1534. So Henry VIII. is among the angels! Such are the absurdities of this argumentation. We hope that it will be more and more abandoned. And it should be noted that the Fifty-two Congress Books* issued in connection with this month's Congress are conspicuously liberal in their attitude to modern knowledge.

The other danger is *Clericalism*.

It is inevitable and right that the clergy should take the lead in the development of devotional methods now so characteristic of the movement. But it would be a serious matter if this were to result in the overshadowing of other elements of life which give exercise to the special vocation of the laity, and where the leadership is naturally theirs. The priesthood of the clergy is ministerial; and we deprecate any fashions or habits of mind which foster the notion that they are not men like other men. The moment that religion becomes unduly identified with the clerical office, the way is open for that reaction against it which in this country we have happily been spared. Clericalism begets Anti-clericalism; and in that conflict it is always Christ who is dishonoured. What we want is the profession of common principles in language of the widest appeal. That is why we lay such stress upon loyalty to lawful standards. For they are the levellers of priest and people, the charter of rights and duties to both. And without such a charter religion tends inevitably to drift into the clerical moulds either of Rome or of Nonconformity.

But we believe the movement to be essentially healthy, and we look to the issue of Prayer Book Revision to demonstrate it. What the main body of Catholics want is an enrichment and adaptation of the present rite which will bring out more clearly the meaning of the Eucharist. On grounds of principle we plead for an enlargement in the scope of the Prayer for the Church to include the blessed Dead and the Saints in glory; the transference of the Prayer of Humble Access to a point outside the Thanksgiving; a Consecration Prayer containing a definite assertion of the Eucharistic

* Soc. of SS. Peter and Paul. 3d. each.

Sacrifice, and proceeding through an Anamnesis and prayer of Oblation to its climax in the Lord's Prayer; and a rubric providing for Reservation. Some would add—perhaps rightly—the transference of the Fraction to the end of the Canon.* We believe that if these points are urged in the National Assembly, not as likely to satisfy a party, but *on their merits*, they will be gained. Other points, not of principle, but of taste or convenience, will have to be waived. Naturally, the present elasticity in the matter of ceremonial, marking the difference between "plain" and "solemn" services, will be preserved; though it would be an advantage if some steps could be taken towards reducing the number of types of ceremonial. But when the work is finished, *Quo Vadis?* We believe that the great majority of the Catholic movement will reply, "Towards unity and obedience"; and the whole English Church will be strengthened.

Finally, we may hope that, as one result of such restored understanding, we shall enjoy again a sufficient supply of the best kind of men for the Sacred Ministry. No problem before the Church is half so urgent as this. We do not believe that vocation is rarer than it was at our Public Schools and Universities, nor that parents are more grudging of their sons to the clerical calling. But nowhere are the qualities of reserve and balance and respect for order more earnestly instilled or more highly esteemed than in the restricted circle of English higher education; and its young men will not pledge their services for life to an institution honeycombed with indiscipline. What draws them to decision is the example of other clergy—the consistency and humanity of their lives, the effectiveness of their work, the spirit of loyalty to their colleagues, and of submission to proper authority. They must see in them, that is to say, though tuned to finer issues, the qualities they have been schooled by their traditions to admire and to emulate. They must be assured, moreover, that ability is recognized and used, whatever school of thought it reflect, in this profession as in any other, and that for every honest worker, in whatever line, there shall be found ample scope. Then we may expect that the adage which spoke of the English clergy as *stupor mundi* will again be justified, and that the land which our Church serves first of all will find its chief glory in the Faith of Christ.

* It may be observed that Presbyterian divines have commented adversely on the present position of the Fraction in the Anglican liturgy, as contravening the symbolism of the institution. *Cf.* Dr. Sprot, *Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland*, p. 127.

DANTE AND JUSTINIAN*

DANTE's last years were spent in Ravenna, and there the *Paradiso* was completed, so far as the cantos are concerned.† And within these cantos it is that Justinian occupies a place of conspicuous grandeur. No sooner has the poet arrived with Beatrice in the Heaven of Mercury than he is spoken to by one of the blest spirits‡ who dwell there, who had high aims in life for the sake of honour, who calls him as happy-born to whom grace is given to see while still alive on earth the throne of the eternal triumph, to ask what he will from their enlightening power. Who speaks?

> "But who thou art, blest soul, I cannot know."

And how came he to that sphere of light?

The spirit grows far more radiant ere it answers, and is like the sun hiding himself from human eyes through excess of brightness.

> "Concealed himself from me in his own ray,
> The holy shape for very jubilance;
> And thus fast folded did in answer say
> In fashion as the following canto chants."

Then at the beginning of the sixth canto comes the famous passage in which he who was once Cæsar upon earth, now after death bearing his personal name Justinian, tells how two centuries after Constantine had moved the imperial power from West to East he, by the will of the Primal Love, which now in Paradise he feels, took from the laws what was excessive and what was useless, once believed that there was One Nature only in Christ, but was converted by the chief shepherd Agabito; then, moving with clear vision along the Church's path, gave himself wholly to the laws:

> "Inspired by grace divine to that high care."

The victories of Belisarius proved that in so doing he was doing right. Thus he becomes to Dante the historian of the empire. He tells how the imperial eagle through the ages led the might of Rome, executing divine justice for man's sin,

* A few lines in this paper are repeated *verbatim* from the writer's book, *The Church of the Sixth Century* (London, 1897), which has been long out of print. Where a passage from Dante is quoted in English, the translation is usually that of Mr. Melville Best Anderson (Harrap and Company, 1921).

† *Ecl.*, i. 64. It is true the words are, "Hac implebo decem missurus vascula Mopso," but this is universally taken to mean that the ten cantos were complete already.

‡ *Paradiso*, v. 115 *seq.*; and Tozer, *in loc.*

and taking vengeance on the Jews; so on the object of contention between Guelf and Ghibelline, while the active spirits do battle for the right, receiving from the living justice of God eternal and unstained happiness: even is the loyal servant Romeo rejected by his earthly master, but shining among the pearls of heaven. His story of the empire, chequered but sublime, told, the spirit turns with the rest in the solemn dance, singing:

> "Hosannah, holy God of Hosts, Thou who
> Dost all the blessed fires that burn
> Within the kingdom with Thy light outshine."

So combining the lights of law and empire, he is veiled from sight. Thus the great Emperor appears at a moment of revelation of the glorious world of God, who guides the history of man and shows its meaning in the paradise of His love, and it is he who reveals to Dante this eternal lesson of the life of man. He is himself the pattern of those who sought honour in the active life. In the *Purgatorio*, too, he is referred to in the same tone of homage. It is like the old adage of S. Augustine in the *De Civitate Dei* now: What are realms without laws to rule them, what laws without power to enforce them ?

> "What boots Justinian adjust the rein,
> If ever empty be the saddle ?"*

and in the *Canzionere*† Florence is adjured to follow the light he gave and amend her laws.

Justinian, then, to the mind of Dante is one of the holy spirits who are kindled by the light of heaven:‡ he is a soul worthy of this greatness, a light of increasing brightness, a sacred figure shedding brightness around.

In Dante the historical Justinian may be said to reach the highest point of his fame. The great ruler, and lawyer, and theologian, and architect, and conqueror, or inspirer and leader of those who ruled and made laws for State and Church, and built, and fought, is seen in glory among the saints of God.

It was natural that the fame of this great Emperor should impress itself so deeply upon the mind of the poet, who was spending the last years of his life in banishment in the city that was more than any other in Italy full of the memories of Justinian. In his time were built or adapted for Catholic use some of the finest buildings of Ravenna. S. Apollinare Nuovo dates from 500, but was claimed for Catholic worship when the city was captured by the army of Justinian. S.

* *Purg.*, vi. 89.

† xviii. 37. Not written by Dante, but given in the 1895 Oxford edition of his works. In the new edition this will be corrected.

‡ *Par.*, v. 121, 128, 130, 131-132, 137.

Apollinare in Classe—the "best preserved early Christian basilica in Italy," Kraus calls it—was begun by Julius Argentarius in 534, and consecrated by Maximianus in 549. S. Vitale, begun before 534, was consecrated in 547, and bears a striking resemblance to the church of S. Sergius and S. Bacchus in Constantinople. The magnificent mosaics of S. Vitale and S. Apollinare Nuovo are of Justinian's day. Dante must have looked on the lean ascetic Oriental face, which one sees on the wall of S. Apollinare Nuovo, and the dignified full-length figure in the imperial robes in the procession with Maximianus at S. Vitale. He may also have seen the marble bust which Girolamo Fabri* speaks of as standing in his day on one side of the altar in San Vitale. Certainly Ravenna, as an imperial city, spoke conspicuously of the time of the greatest Emperor of the early Middle Age. And in Justinian Dante may well have seen personified his ideal of imperial authority—Christian, Catholic, conquering, independent of papal power. Nor, I think, can there be any doubt that this was the judgment passed upon Justinian in Ravenna, or that it is the judgment, putting aside any question of opposition to the Papacy, held in that city to-day. Justinian, even more than Theodoric, is the great figure in Ravenna's history.

And such is the judgment of by far the greater number of the historians contemporary with Justinian. Typical is Procopius: "As for religion, which he found uncertain and torn by various heresies, he destroyed everything which could lead to error, and securely established the true faith upon one solid foundation."† Or, a century later, Paul the Deacon: "This prince was catholic in faith, righteous in works, just in judgments: wherefore all things in him worked together for good."‡ Gregory the Great, who was himself at Constantinople in the last year of Justinian's life, never speaks of his memory with anything but reverence, or with any hint that he was ever otherwise than staunchly orthodox. Little more than a century after Justinian's death, the Sixth General Council met at Constantinople. Here representatives of East and West alike spoke with no uncertain voice. The testimony of the Conciliar Acts is confirmed by Nicephorus. Pope Agatho, in his letter to Constantine Pogonatus, appeals to the support of the "pious memory" of Justinian in his assertion of the doctrine of the Two Natures. And the whole Council received and approved his letter. Throughout the Acts of the Council, whenever Justinian is mentioned, it is with some such phrase as "ὁ τῆς θείας λήξεως."

* *Ravenna Ricercata*, Bologna, 1678.
† *De Ædif.*, i. 1.
‡ *Hist. Lang.*, i. 25.

Again, Nicephorus tells how he was yearly commemorated in the sacred offices at S. Sophia and in the church of S. John at Ephesus. Among the Latins, too, his memory was reverenced by the whole Church. Dante, in his admiration, is merely accepting the judgment of the West in his day, as well as of the East. There can be no doubt, of course, that Justinian was a competent, perhaps an eminent, theologian. He may even, perhaps, be considered the most important theologian of the sixth century, if we except the rather hazy Leontius, of whom Dr. Loofs and Dr. Harnack have made so much. There is no ground at all—not the faintest, so far as I know—for believing that Dante was right in thinking that he was ever a Monophysite and was converted by Agapetus. The Pope did convict the patriarch Anthimus of this heresy, and he was therefore deposed: but certainly never the Emperor. In the theological confusion of those difficult days he seems to have walked delicately and securely. The same cannot be said of his wife, that most wonderful of medieval Empresses.

When M. Debidour, in his clever study of the Empress Theodora,* makes an oppressive list of all warring opinions which in the reign of Justinian claimed to be Christian, he argues that Theodora, whom so many contemporary writers declare to have never ceased to be a Monophysite, had lived in the midst of the theological confusion of Alexandria and Antioch, had learnt her opinions from Severus, and remained his lifelong disciple. Long after this patriarch's disgrace he wrote to her, and if she could not win for him the favour of Justinian, it was from no lack of effort. No trace can be found, or at least no proof can be given, of Theodora having at any time influenced her husband in favour of unorthodoxy, least of all in favour of the Aphthartodoketes, and, indeed, she died fourteen years before the date at which Evagrius alleges the Emperor to have lapsed. I come at last to the point of contradiction to Dante's view. There are contemporary writers who declare Justinian to have died a heretic.

It is to be noted that these writers do not deny the general orthodoxy of Justinian; in spite of the rather doubtful attitude of Harnack on the point, who seems to hint that the Emperor was unstable in his opinions in the earlier part of his reign, it really seems impossible to doubt it. His attitude at all the ecclesiastical councils of his reign, and his own lengthy theological treatises, abundantly prove his orthodoxy. Harnack† really admits the orthodoxy of Justinian, the most influential theologian of the time, when he says:

* *Théodora*, pp. 129 *seq.*
† *Dogmengeschichte*, Engl. trans., vol. iv., p. 234.

"It is undeniable that Chalcedonian orthodoxy was first firmly established in the East in the age of Justinian—that is to say, inner agreement with the Chalcedonian creed was then first secured to any large extent, and this without abandoning Cyril's religious theology, but, on the contrary, while emphasizing it and giving it the preference. If this is so, then the only possible explanation of these facts is that supplied by the entrance of Aristotelian scholasticism into the Church. The Chalcedonian dogma is lost in philosophical theology."

Elsewhere* says Harnack:

"As the reign of Justinian was signalized politically by the restoration of the Byzantine supremacy and the codification of its laws, it was ecclesiastically distinguished by the restoration and establishment of the constitution and dogmatics of the Church. . . . The Justinian Church condemned the glorious Fathers, and the Fifth Ecumenical Council blotted out the freer theological science. However, this measure was only possible for the Church because theology had developed in the first part of the sixth century (see Loofs, Leontius von Byzanz, in the *Texten und Unters. z. Alt-Christl. Literaturgesch.*, vol. iii., parts 1 and 2, pp. 37 *ff.*, 303 *ff.*). It presupposed the Chalcedonian formula, which had become more venerable by age, and explained it by means of the philosophy of Aristotle, which had then come once more to the front, in order to reconcile it with the spirit of Cyril's theology and to make it in some measure comprehensible. *Here we have the rise of ecclesiastical scholasticism.* . . . Justinian in reality closed not only the school of Athens,† but also that of Origen, the schools, *i.e.*, of productive theological science and criticism."

Again, in a later volume Harnack‡ says that Justinian's policy had the support of "those who were skilled in the Aristotelian philosophy," the "new conservatives" Leontius of Byzantium and his friends, "who made terms with the Two Natures in the same way as the Oriental scholars in the fourth century did with the ὁμοούσιος; and it is this conviction which lies at the basis of Justinian's policy in reference both to the Church and the State."

Justinian, of course, did not close the school of Athens by any formal act; but it is rather curious that he should not only be made responsible (and probably justly) for the end of their teaching, and yet said to have based all the later theology of the Church, by the aid of Leontius, on Aristotelianism. At the same time Harnack§ declares that the Emperor "destroyed the Western influence; he carried the Chalcedonian

* *Dogmengeschichte*, Engl. trans., vol. iii., p. 154. † Not formally.
‡ iv. 241. § iv. 247

creed back to Cyril; he restored the dogmatic thought of the two Councils of Ephesus without meddling with the creed of Chalcedon." He "did not impose anything on the Church; on the contrary, he ascertained what were the true feelings of the majority, probably realized them himself." Now orthodoxy may, in Harnack's or anybody else's mind, be right or wrong, but this surely means that Justinian was orthodox.

As briefly as possible the theological decisions of the Emperor's reign, in which he had an intimate concern, must be enumerated. Immediately after his accession he procured the reunion of East and West on the acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon and the tome of S. Leo, and the condemnation of the Monophysites (519), to whose extirpation it may be said that the whole of the rest of the reign was devoted. Then there was the curious controversy as to the expression "One of the Trinity suffered in the flesh [upon the cross]." This was prominent in 519, and again fourteen years later. Popes, and prelates, and monks discussed and squabbled, but the patient persistence of the Emperor succeeded at last when Pope John II. declared the phrase, "One Person of the Trinity was crucified," to be orthodox. His judgment was confirmed by the Fifth General Council.*

This tedious controversy may be regarded—indeed, has been regarded†—as a triumph for the Emperor. At the first he had pierced to the heart of the matter when he exclaimed to Hormisdas, "The strife seems only to turn on words; as to the sense, Catholics are united." He learnt not to look to Rome for a decision. The Pope would not, or could not, decree; and the Emperor began to look, if he had not looked before, for the voice of the Church in a General Council.

Next came a series of determined efforts for the suppression of Monophysitism: the visit of Pope Agapetus, the deposition of the patriarch Anthimus (it is possible that the Emperor may for a moment have defended him), and the condemnation of Severus of Antioch and other Monophysite leaders. A decree dated August 6, 536‡ (the year when Belisarius was consul), was addressed to the new patriarch of Constantinople, with an injunction to convey its message to the Eastern churches. It contains a short sketch of the heresy of the Monophysite leaders, and then, ratifying by the civil power the decision of Agapetus and the holy synod, it pronounces sentence of deposition and banishment.

* Mansi, *Concilia*, ix. 384. The phrase was preserved in the hymn Ὁ *μονογενής*, which was inserted in the Mass, and the composition of which is ascribed to Justinian himself.

† Knecht, *Die Religions-Politik Kaiser Justinians I.* (Würzburg, 1896), p. 89.

‡ Migne, *Pat. Græc.*, lxxxvi. (i.) 1095 *sqq.*

Menas was the new patriarch, and presided over a synod which condemned the bishops and deposed them—Anthimus now losing even the See of Trebizond—following and obeying, as Menas declared, the decision of Agapetus, but recognizing that nothing could be done without the Emperor's knowledge and command,* a statement which has been somewhat exaggerated into a view that the Emperor was to dictate the theology of the Church.†

It is not necessary to dwell upon the controversy with the Origenists: I have quoted Harnack's view of it. At any rate, its conclusion represented the general judgment of the Church, which, when it was confirmed by a General Council, dealt rather with Origenism than with Origen. It cannot be said that Origen lies under anathema as a heretic. Nor is it necessary to discuss the controversy of the Three Chapters. (The expression referred originally to an edict of Justinian condemning (1) Theodore of Mopsuestia and his works, (2) certain writings of Theodoret, (3) a letter of Ibas; but later on it came to mean the opinions which were condemned.) This involved, perhaps, the most complicated series of tergiversations of which a Pope has ever been guilty: Vigilius played a pitiable part when the Fifth General Council sat at Constantinople (553). Its work may be briefly summarized by saying that it safeguarded the Christian faith by exposing the logical consequences of statements which directly impugned the Divine and Human Natures of the Incarnate Son. Its judgments were in perfect harmony with those of earlier councils.

This much has been said of the controversies of the reign, because Justinian played so great a part in them, and the part was always an orthodox one. It is necessary also to say a word about his theological writings. These occupy about twelve hundred pages of Migne's *Patrologia Græca*, but this, of course, does not include the Emperor's ecclesiastical laws (mostly in the *Novellæ*), which themselves partake of the nature of theological treatises. The actual "works" are ten theological letters, a hymn (which we now happily have translated by Canon Lacey in the English Hymnal), and seven theological treatises. These last are concerned with Origenism, with Monophysitism, and with the controversy of the Three Chapters. Their theology is that of a lawyer—that is, it relies very greatly on precedent, and it has not a few good, terse, clear definitions. The general confession of faith, issued at the time of the Three Chapters controversy, is, perhaps, the clearest exposition of orthodox belief as it was held in the sixth century.

* Mansi, *Concilia*, viii. 980-984.

† See Bury, *Later Roman Empire* (1923), ii. 392-393.

So far it is clear that the Emperor was orthodox of the orthodox. There was hardly a dogma of the Catholic Church which he had not defended, scarcely a heresy which he had not traced and confuted. So historians might have left him, and he would have been remembered as a pillar of orthodoxy.

But his later years have not escaped a charge, the strangeness of which is remarkable indeed in the case of such a man. Most, if not all, modern historians have declared that at the end of his life he adopted the opinions of an heretical sect, and endeavoured to enforce on others a view which he had before most strenuously condemned. Baronius, I think, was the first to make the statement emphatic; Alemannus (or at least his editor) and then Gibbon with great enjoyment took up the tale. Mr. Bryce (as he then was) added the sanction of his great knowledge, and Dr. Hodgkin, with some apparent hesitation,* adhered to the statement, which Mr. Bury reiterates† in his revised history of the later empire, a monument of accuracy and learning. And, indeed, when some twenty years ago I ventured to express a doubt of the evidence on which their conclusions had been based, I believed that only one writer had taken the view which I felt bound to assert. In 1616 the famous Dr. Richard Crakanthorpe, of whom Antony Wood speaks so highly as a student of the Fathers and the Canonists, printed a very virulent and not very critical attack on Baronius entitled "Justinian the Emperor defended against the Cardinal Baronius." The pamphlet is somewhat rare, and has not been used, so far as I know, by anyone except Dr. Bury and myself. It is, nevertheless, of considerable interest, and though I cannot accept many of its statements, I have made occasional use of it in the discussion of this question which I began many years ago.

I will not repeat what I have written, but I should like to add that there is another seventeenth-century pamphlet which is, if nothing else, certainly more amusing than Dr. Crakanthorpe's. It is Thomas Rivers's‡ "Defence of the Emperor Justinian against Alemannus," who was the first editor of the egregious *Anecdota* of Procopius. He does not deal with the specific charge which aroused the ire of Crakanthorpe, but he devotes an exasperated and humorous eloquence to the task of showing that the great Emperor was (among many other things) a great and orthodox Christian. His final exhortation to

* *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. v., p. 58, note.

† *History of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. ii., pp. 393-394 and note.

‡ *Im. Justiniani defensio adv. Alemannum.* Autore Thoma Rivers I. C. Regis in Anglia Advocato. Londini, excudebat G. Stansbeius, 1626.

Alemannus is that he should remember that "stultum est et impium defunctorum tumulos et sepulchra venerari, memoriam vero et famam convitiis et maledictis lædere." One of the charges Alemannus reiterates from the *Anecdota* is that Justinian savagely punished the faults of the clergy; and Mr. Rivers, being a lawyer, will not hear of this as being a blemish on the character of a great and good man, though he seems to hint that it might be considered such at the Vatican. Moreover, to prove that it is not justified, he goes through the patriarchs and shows that it is not true as regards any of them. He seems to know of no ill-treatment of Eutychius, by the way. To him the great age of the Emperor is an added glory and dignity, not, as in the eyes of Alemannus, a period of contempt and dotage. The contempt is reserved for Procopius, who in the *Anecdota* declares that Justinian had an ass's head, which might have better fitted Alemannus. Justinian's orthodoxy throughout his life is vindicated: "facile etiam patior, Alemanne, Justinianum nostrum hæreticorum flagellum appellari." And at last he deals with the charge of Evagrius, who declares Justinian to have fallen (so Rivers puts it) into the Eutychian heresy. But he shows that the dates and the eulogy of the Fifth General Council refute this; and the hymns of the great Emperor are sung in the sacred solemnities of the Greek churches still, and if he himself no longer appears in the menology, yet for long he was commemorated on the Kalends of August. Mr. Rivers ends on a high note.

It is more than time that I came to the evidence for the charge. The charge is that Justinian became an Aphthartodokete, and that for refusing to accept this heresy he banished the patriarch of Constantinople, Eutychius. Ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται was the name given by the followers of Severus, the Monophysite, who from 513 to 518 was patriarch of Antioch, and afterwards founded a Monophysite seat in Alexandria, to the followers of Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus. The Julianists declared that by the union of the Godhead with the Manhood in Christ His body became "sinless, imperishable, and incorruptible . . . in itself His body was exempt from ordinary human experience."* To accept this view would be entirely contrary to a great deal that Justinian had written in the clearest language. But the assertion is that he not only did so, but deposed the patriarch of Constantinople for refusing to follow him.

The life of Eutychius (512-582), by his chaplain Eustathius, is in the *Acta Sanctorum*. It states that Justinian, "inspired by I know not what authority and teacher, began to

* R. L. Ottley, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*, ii. 121.

set forth that detested and pernicious opinion under the form of religion, which asserts that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was incorrupt because of its union with the Godhead."

A more important authority, Evagrius, says (I use the quaint translation of Meredith Hanmer, published in 1636):

"At the selfsame time Justinian, treading out of the way of true doctrine, and lighting on such a path as neither the Apostles nor the Fathers ever led him unto, fell among briars and brambles, with the which he purposed to stuff the Church of God; yet brought he not his will about, for the Lord had fortified the highway with such strong hedges that murderers could not leap over, as if—according to the prophecy—the wall had been broken down and the hedge broken. Wherefore, the same time when John, surnamed Cateline, was Bishop of Old Rome, after the death of Vigilius, John Sirmius of Constantinople, Apollinarius of Alexandria, Anastasius after Domninus of Theopolis, otherwise called Antioch, and Macarius, now restored unto his proper See of Jerusalem, when the council after the deprivation of Eustochius condemned Origen, Didymus, and Evagrius, Justinian wrote an edict"—τὸ καλούμενον πρός Ῥωμαίων ἴδικτον γράφει is the original—"wherein he affirmed that the body of the Lord was not subject to death or corruption; that it was void of such affections as nature engrafted, and were unblamable; that the Lord ate before His Passion in such sort as He did after His resurrection; that His most holy body was nothing altered nor changed, either in the framing thereof in the womb, or in the voluntary and natural motions; no, not after His resurrection: unto which opinion he purposed to compel bishops to subscribe." Then, after an account of Anastasius of Antioch, he adds that the edict of Justinian was never published, because he died suddenly. As to other authorities, Procopius and Agathias have both come to an end. At Antioch we have a writer who probably lived about 700, and is called John the Rhetorician, or Malalas, whose chronicle ends with an incomplete reference* to an insurrection in Africa in 563, two years before Justinian's death. He mentions a few lines before the edict on the Two Natures, wrongly dating it. The annotator Edmund Chilmead adds: "Scilicet sub extrema vitæ suæ tempora in Aphthartodocitarum Hæresia delapsus est Justinianus: uti testantur Evagrius, lib. 4, cap. 38; Nicephorus Call., lib. 17, cap. 29; Glycas *Annæ*, part 4 et Cedrenus; qui etiam eodem anno de quo Auctor noster hic loquitur, imperatorem edictum suum *De corruptibili et incorruptibili* proposuisse asserit; cui astipulatur Glycas, loco citato." Of the other authorities Theophanes, who can hardly

* xviii. 495.

be contemporary, briefly summarizes Evagrius. Nicephorus, too, is a derived authority. Later writers, such as Glycas, seem to be the like. There are contemporaries who say nothing, such as Victor of Tonnenna, who mentions the banishment of Eutychius, but assigns no reason. But there is a letter of Nicetius, Bishop of Trier,* which appears to be addressed to Justinian, and accuses him of heresy.

It bitterly bewails a lapse into heresy, and a persecution even to death of "fathers beforetime venerated." It makes, however, not the slightest allusion to Aphthartodocetism. It alludes to Nestorius and Eutyches, and urges the Emperor to anathematize them; it appeals to the judgment of Him "whom you have deprived of His honours and made a mere man." Its whole tone, in fact, is one of condemnation of a heretic who had espoused an error long recognized and long condemned by the Church. Now, it is inconceivable that Aphthartodoketism could be considered to make of Christ "a mere man." It declared that His body was impassible, incapable of suffering or death. It denied an essential characteristic of the Lord's Humanity; it was an extreme form of Monophysitism, but Nestorian it certainly could not be. It plainly accuses Justinian of heresy, but a heresy which is quite incompatible with Aphthartodoketism.

Two—I hope and think only two—other writers remain whom it behoves us to consider if we are really to discover whether Justinian became an Aphthartodokete or whether Dante was justified in regarding him as a pillar of true belief.

The Syriac Chronicle, commonly called that of Zachariah of Mitylene,† is apparently only, as far as books 3 to 6 are concerned, the work of that writer Zachariah, "a rhetor or scholastic of Gaza," who became Bishop of Mitylene and died somewhere between 536, when he was present at the synod, and 553. The chronicle, as we now have it, incorporating in epitome the work of Zachariah, was completed in 569, and for the latter part the writer has used the work of John of Ephesus. This chronicle is one of the most important authorities for the obscure history of the obscure heresy with which Justinian is charged by Evagrius. The writer gives a long, but a rather confused account of the dispute between Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, and Severus, patriarch of Antioch.‡ Julian, he says, in his desire to avoid speaking of the two natures, fell into Eutychianism. He wrote a treatise against the Diphysites (as the Monophysite writers, of whom Zachariah of Mitylene is a vigorous champion, called the orthodox). Of

* In Hontheim, *Historia Diplomatica*, i., 47-8, and Freher, *Hist. Franc.*, i., 89.
† Ed. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks, 1899.
‡ *Zach. Mit.*, bk. ix., chap. ix. *sqq.*

Julian's heresy Severus in time heard—as, indeed, what theologian does not soon hear of the alleged heresies or the imaginary iniquities of his theological friends? The patriarch then proceeded to write to the bishop. The correspondence between them, which occupies several chapters of the chronicle, is not without its diversions to the reader. It illustrates the fact which Lord Hugh Cecil mentioned the other day, that bishops have a curious habit of expressing themselves, in which, while disguising their real opinions, they endeavour to attain their object by a circuitous route. Julian in an involved epistle declared that he could not "consider it right that we should again say that that which was not corrupted was susceptible of corruption." Certain men had come to him who had quoted S. Cyril to the effect that the body of the Lord, subject to human infirmities in life, was incorruptible after death, and they quoted the same father as saying that the body of the Lord was in no way subjected to the sin which brings corruption, but was susceptible of death and true burial, thus apparently implying corruption: and this Julian "considered to be a mistake in writing." The reply of Severus is a marvel of polite involution: the doctors of the holy Church have instructed him differently: "There appears to me something unseemly in the things written by you"—but by no means let anyone in ignorance think that our discussion implies hostility, for it abounds in love. Julian's reply is a little tart, so far as a bishop can be so: he comes to the verge of annoyance, though very politely, at having been told that he had written something unseemly, wants to know what it is, and reiterates his opinion. "Very strange" indeed does Severus think this reply. Truly has Julian said that doctors cannot be in opposition to one another; so instead of dealing with the question of incorruptibility, he slides off into that common refuge of harassed theologians, the apparent difference but real agreement between S. Paul and S. James as to faith and works: a very long letter, and nothing to the point. So one is not surprised to learn that "when Julian received this epistle also from this learned Severus, he was very indignant and was moved with anger, and he wrote saying that his request had been refused by him for a year and a month, and he had not received the respect due to him, and he had been tricked." And then Severus wrote a long treatise declaring the Lord's body to have been "susceptible of innocent passions except sin till after the Resurrection." And then Zachariah goes off into the Nika riot and into a defence of the Monophysites. This leads at last to a letter of Severus to Justinian, irrelevant for the most part to our subject, which eventually turns into a vehement

denunciation of Julian, who " has been perverted to the heresy of the Manichees, and reckons the voluntary saving passions of Christ, the great God, as a phantasy." This is skilfully and drastically argued; but even Zachariah gets tired of it and says: " The rest of the fatuity of Julian which is contained at great length in this epistle I forbear to record now." Severus at last went to Constantinople, where he was greatly favoured by Theodora; and much complicated intrigue is recorded, ending with the arrival of Agapetus, at which " the whole city was disturbed, and the earth with all that is upon it quaked, and several other curious natural or unnatural phenomena occurred. But Agapetus had a splendid reception from Justinian, because he spoke the same language, and was chief priest of the country of Italy, which had been conquered and brought into subjection to him." But to Zachariah the Pope is a heretic because he believed in the two natures, and perverted the love of the King from the Monophysites Severus and Anthimus. This last statement is a possible clue to the view that Agapetus converted the Emperor from Monophysitism: he turned away his heart, Zachariah thinks, from the Monophysite bishops. But he never has the audacity to say that Justinian had ever been a Monophysite, or that he became an Aphthartodokete. And then there are several more episcopal epistles, ending with one from Theodosius, patriarch of Alexandria, addressed to Anthimus, some time of Constantinople, arguing for Monophysitism and the impassibility of Christ.

From another distant part of the world, out of the way to our minds, and at any rate far from the centre of imperial power, comes another statement as to the heresy of Justinian. John, Coptic Bishop of Nikiu, flourished about the end of the seventh century (*c.* A.D. 690), and wrote a chronicle* which is of the greatest value for the history of Egypt, not so much for the empire to which it belonged. But in ecclesiastical history his work certainly has importance even where he is not contemporary. The book, originally written in Greek, and then translated into Arabic, exists now only in an Ethiopic translation (which has been put into English by Dr. Charles, who rigidly refrains from any historical criticism). John of Nikiu has clearly used several contemporary historians for the reign of Justinian, such as John Malalas; and it seems to me that he certainly read Zachariah of Mitylene. In regard to the particular matter, like Zachariah, he mixes his dates, taking the Monophysite controversy and the Fifth General Council after the dispute between Justinian and Eutychius. I think what he says† as to this should be quoted entire:

* Translated and edited by Dr. R. H. Charles, 1916. † John Nikiu, ch. xciv.

"And there was discussion as to the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and much controversy in the city of Constantinople as to its being corruptible or incorruptible. And they were agitated in the city of Alexandria regarding this controversy which had arisen between the two factions, (*a*) the Theodosians, and (*b*) the Gaïnians. And the Emperor Justinian sent to Eutychius, the patriarch of the city of Constantinople at that time, and asked him regarding this matter. He agreed in doctrinal views with Theodosius and Severus. Accordingly, he answered and said unto him: 'The body of our Lord, which submitted to suffering on behalf of our salvation, is living, imperishable, incorruptible, and unchangeable. We believe that He suffered voluntarily. And after the Resurrection He was incorruptible and unchangeable in all aspects and ways.' But the Emperor did not accept this pronouncement. Now the true solution of this question is to be found in the letter sent by the holy Cyril to Successus. But the Emperor inclined to the views of Julian, a bishop of the Gaïnian party, who had the same doctrine; for they said, 'He was a man like us,' and the holy Scriptures say 'Christ suffered for us in the body.' And the Emperor Justinian was wroth with the patriarch Eutychius because he had not sent him a reply such as he desired, but a pronouncement like that of Severus and Anthimus. 'These [he said] had deceived the inhabitants of Constantinople, and this [Eutychius] likewise had deceived them.' And thereupon he sent a letter to Agathon, the prefect of Alexandria, with orders to appoint Apollinaris, Count of the Monastery of Banton, to be patriarch of the Chalcedonians in the city of Alexandria and the other cities of Egypt. But the inhabitants of this city were strongly attached to the incorruptibility dogma, and followed the teaching of our fathers, written in books, which declares: 'The holy body of our Lord was incorruptible before the resurrection, and He submitted to suffering of His own will unto death, but since the resurrection it has become immortal and impassible.' Such was the declaration of Gregory the theologian. Wherefore it behoves us, touching the proposition of the incorruptibility, to set aside the salutary suffering which He endured in the body of His own free will and power and accomplished on behalf of our salvation. And the Emperor Justinian deposed Eutychius the patriarch of Constantinople, and appointed John of the city of Jûdans, who promised to give the Emperor an autograph letter signifying his agreement with him in the faith, and likewise to write a synodal letter. But when he received the [patriarchal] dignity, he set at naught the command of the Emperor, and refused to write as he had promised him."

John then curiously and confusedly goes off into Monophy-

sitism, and represents Justinian as ready to issue an edict against it when he died.

Here I think I may well end; and I fear it cannot be said that the matter is cleared up. The theology of the age is confusing, and I think it was confused: the historians of the time are often fragmentary, incoherent, contradictory. I have tried to understand them, but I am by no means sure that I have always succeeded. And I certainly only with the greatest diffidence venture to lift a hesitating finger of protest when Professor Bury still considers that "the testimonies are too strong and circumstantial to be set aside or evaded."

Return, then, for a last word to our poet. It cannot be said that Dante ignored or deprecated any condemnation of heresy. The sixth circle in the *Inferno* proves the contrary. And he does not fear to place a Pope, Anastasius II. (though that may have been a mistake), and an Emperor, Frederick II., among the heretics. If he had believed that Justinian was a heretic, it is incredible that he would have made him one of the glories of the *Paradiso*. He speaks with contempt* as well as condemnation of those who fished for truth and had not the art:†

> "So with Sabellius, Arius, and each sect
> Of fools, who were as swords to Scripture pure,
> Distorting features otherwise correct."

It is true, of course, that Dante had a deep sympathy with reform in the Church: it may be said that he passed over lightly those who in his own day were accused of heresy, perhaps in ecclesiastical politics rather than in theology;‡ but it is certainly not true that he condoned what had been adjudged to be heresy by the Church.

Alberto Agresti, in one of his *Note Dantesche* upon the poet's attitude towards the medieval heretics,§ says very truly:

"Por Dante il monarca non doveva essere solo un bello, un prode, un magnifico signore, ma un religioso uomo; fosse stato pino severissimo, come il *buon* Barbarossa: e condanno Federico II."

Dante, then, did not think that Justinian died as a heretic, or he would never have put him among the saints in Paradise. Had he not practically all the means of forming an opinion that we have? At second hand, at least, I think he had. He took the judgment of the Church for his guide; and that judgment declared the Emperor to be pious, orthodox, a defender of the Faith.

W. H. Hutton.

* *Paradiso*, xiii. 121 *seq.* † *Ibid.*, 127 *seq.*
‡ *Cf.* F. Tocco, *Dante e l'Eresia*, Bologna, 1899.
§ Napoli, 1896, p. 27.

THIRTY-THREE YEARS AT ST. PAUL'S (1890–1923)

THIRTY-THREE years' work at any post—thirty-three years at St. Paul's—and these thirty-three such years as the last, may, perhaps, justify a brief retrospect on the part of one who has been called upon to take a share in the life of a great Cathedral in a period of change, activity, storm and stress, calculated to try every man's work, of what sort it is, and to test the foundation on which it is built.

The autumn of the year 1890 witnessed the death of that great man Dean Church. Loving as he did to be unknown, with no memorial of him, as by his express desire, among the honoured dead, he, as we all know, had been foremost in that wonderful revival of Church life which laid the foundation of all the work and spiritual activity which now distinguishes St. Paul's.

Anyone who in that year might be called upon to take any part in that work would find himself in a great atmosphere of religious activity, where in every direction, from the choir-boys up to the Dean and Chapter, everyone was beginning to build upon the foundation so truly laid, some of the gold, silver, and precious stones which might set forth the beauty and glory of religious worship.

The notorious Reredos Case was in that year still *sub lite*, and a certain smouldering of the embers of an expiring fanaticism from time to time blazed up.

But Canon Gregory, who took up the reins of government, lost no time in setting to work to carry on that of which the noble reredos was an instalment—namely, making the place of God's feet glorious, and doing everything which might tend to beautify the gaunt, if magnificent, outline of Wren's masterpiece. Once it had been little else than a mausoleum or a show building, to enter which at all a small payment had to be made.

Already it had risen out of its dead past; its dome was still throbbing with the splendour of Liddon's sermons, and echoing with the voice of the great preachers of the day. It was Dean Church's own advice: *Spartam nactus es, hanc exorna.*

And accordingly we began to see in 1891 the beginning of the great scheme of decoration which Wren had contemplated, and for which many had hoped and prepared. The money had been offered, experiments and designs had been made *ad nauseam*. Gregory was a man of action: a powerful committee was formed, the work was begun, and in about seven

years the choir, the choir aisles, and the quarter-domes were enriched with a splendid series of mosaics, designed by Sir William Richmond and carried out by English workmen. A full description of them is to be found in a book, *Years that are Past* (Wells Gardner and Darton).

It was no light privilege to be associated with a work of this kind, to take part in the suggested scheme, to furnish subjects and texts, to stand on the scaffolding and watch the workmen putting in the *tesseræ*, a work so minute and particular that the ordinary workman would consider it a good day's work if he could cover on the wall to be decorated the size of a pocket handkerchief.

Critics may differ as to the excellency of the work, but apart from its great intrinsic beauty, this at least must be allowed, that the artist succeeded in carrying out a rich and elaborate scheme of colour without obtruding it upon the eye, or doing anything to injure the proportion or dignity of Wren's architecture.

Space fails for the particular enumeration and description of the many things which in these thirty-three years have been added to the enrichment and beauty of the Cathedral, both structurally and in the way of ornament. Two new chapels have been fitted up and a third is in process of completion, and there were added such things as copes for the ministering clergy, processional crosses, a banner, altar frontals, and other works of embroidery and painting. No one who reads the Old Testament will think such things unworthy of mention.

But our thirty-three years claim other things as well, of a more prosaic nature. A new clock recalls our punctual Dean; new electric lighting reminds us of our generous friend Mr. Pierpont Morgan; new heating apparatus, new workshops for the workmen, no longer in the crypt, all tell of a minute care in the accessories and necessary details, which sometimes are overlooked. And now the grim scaffolding in the dome proclaims once more its *Spartam nactus es* to those whose task it is to sustain the fabric where it shows a dangerous weakness.

It is something to have had a share in this and in much else which has been done during these years for the beauty and maintenance of a building of world-wide celebrity.

But we all know that St. Paul's stands for more than architecture, decoration, and material efficiency. And it is in its inner life and living power that it has been tested during years of trial and difficulty, which have marked certain periods in these thirty-three years with a never-dying significance.

St. Paul's has loudly asserted itself to be more than a large church or a lecture-room. It has claimed to be the Cathedral

of a great metropolis, to be as a city set on a hill, a city that cannot be hid.

And what is the Cathedral expression, and how has St. Paul's expressed it? A Cathedral is, or should be, a corporate body animated by a single purpose, and possessed of sufficient cohesion to prosecute this purpose with some consistency and continuity of will. And what is that purpose? First and foremost the offering up to God in its most perfect form all that is meant by divine worship. A Cathedral has to show that divine worship is a work which demands our highest energies, which is entitled to a large share of our time, which merits a costly expenditure of money, of love and care, such as men bestow on what is most important and valuable. To this end the Cathedral furnishes itself with a choir as perfect as possible, and with all the adjuncts of devotion in their most perfect form. The Dean and Chapter will have to exhibit their loving and cordial contribution to the dignity of this worship. They will have no use for that embodiment of mechanical piety the Canon-in-Residence—that is, the man who never goes to church unless he is obliged; neither will they have any use for the man who looks upon his stall as a place of dignified ease after life's battle fought in more strenuous circumstances; nor again for the man who looks upon his Cathedral endowments of time and money as a merciful provision for a life of itinerant preaching and of every sort of activity except that which he is paid to exhibit.

During these thirty-three years we have practically killed our Canon-in-Residence, and it is not unusual to see the whole Chapter, or a large proportion of them, surrounded by a full number of Minor Canons, and sometimes Prebendaries at the daily offices of the church.

It is not possible in the space of an article to speak of the great men who have come before us, and with whom the writer has been associated in this period. To say nothing of those who are now working with us, St. Paul's in these years has had the benefit of the work of such men, among others, as Bishop Browne, the present Bishop of London, the present Archbishop of York, and the much-loved Canon Scott Holland. They have left behind them many great memories, and their works follow them.

But it is impossible to close this article without allusion to the many wonderful events and happenings which will for ever stamp this period in British history with profound significance.

In the year 1897 multitudes were gathered together at St. Paul's to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee. No one who had the privilege of being present will forget the magnificent

Te Deum offered to God on the western steps in the name of the Queen, surrounded by her court and all her great leaders in Church and State, and those who represented the Army and Navy and the distant parts of her great Empire.

During the period Royal visits were no uncommon event. Both King Edward and King George, and the Prince of Wales, were here on many occasions, both of thanksgiving and of mourning. And, indeed, in the newly furnished Chapel of S. Michael and George the King for the first time had a permanent throne in the Cathedral.

St. Paul's played its part in connection with the Coronation. If space allowed, it would be interesting to show how intimately the City, with its C.I.V. contingent, was bound up in the Boer War.

But all other happenings pale in importance before the Great War, with which St. Paul's was closely connected from August 4, 1914, when a contingent of soldiers came to a service on their way to the war, to July 6, 1919, when the King and Queen attended a thanksgiving service on the declaration of peace.

It is impossible to do more than hint at the memorial services, the *Misereres* and the *Te Deums*, the cowardly air raids, the mourning for German outrages, or such catastrophes as the sinking of the *Titanic*, or the funeral of the murdered Nurse Cavell. The point to be insisted on is this—it stands out clearly on a retrospect over the troubled times—that people looked to St. Paul's in time of tribulation and in times of wealth as a place where, in the voice of prayer, supplication, and thanksgiving, they could pour out their hearts before God. Even an apathetic Chapter would have been forced by this great voice of the people to lead them into the presence of God.

And so it goes on. St. Paul's believes itself to be the Parish Church of the Empire. It has tried to be thorough, it has tried to advance in dignity of worship, and in all that makes for true religion. If sometimes it seems to lag behind, perhaps the reason may be this: It is easy work to run up flimsy pillars and carve beautiful capitals; it is safer and better to lay foundations deep and strong, and so to labour at things essential, that other men may enter into our labours.

W. C. E. Newbolt.

RELIGION IN ART

As we all know, there are two opposite spiritual types: one that interprets the second commandment literally as a whole, and also as if each part of it were complete in itself, and the other that desires to lay all that there is of beauty and glory

and skill at the feet of Him who made them. The first kind includes many exceedingly religious persons, persons whom we might fairly speak of as being obsessed by their own notions as to religion, but genuine enough, and among them that early Father of the Church who forbade a convert to allow her young daughter, Paula, even to know for what purpose flutes and other instruments of music existed. (Incidentally, he also forbade her ever to take a bath.)

With this type we are not now concerned; but it may be worth while to glance over the field of painting and see how far Christian artists have really succeeded in expressing in that medium their religious conceptions.

Those ancient Roman wall paintings which may be accepted as conveying the traditional appearance of our Lord and His disciples are naturally of exceptional interest, and it is to be hoped that very soon they may be reproduced in an accessible form. But the interest is historic, not subjective. It is later on, when the Church is acknowledged to be sure about everything —past, present, and future—that we find that hard assurance reflected in the contemporary mosaics and wall pictures; later still, with the revival of a tender and personal devotion to Christ we see, side by side with increased activity in the Church, spiritually beautiful paintings,* revealing just the qualities of tenderness, trust, *humour*, and desire to serve that we find in St. Francis; and later, again, the Renaissance glorification of physical beauty and splendour finds its echo unfailingly in the great altar pieces, painted ceilings, and subject pictures of the day. It is not only the spirit of the painter which is exhibited to us, but also the spirit of the age in which he lived.

Probably we are unwise to allow our children to become over-familiar with Italian Renaissance works of art that deal with sacred subjects. It was not a time when the ideas of men (at any rate, of the Latin races) regarding God were particularly sublime, and we shrink from the abundant written evidence which confronts us regarding the amazing blasphemies perpetrated by the very men who stood for religion. In a pageant, for instance, lovely little boys were painted and winged to represent cherubs, the fairest maidens were chosen to personate angels, and the first Person in the Blessed Trinity was played by the Pope himself, to the general satisfaction.

That is not the kind of attitude toward the Holiest which we desire to encourage, and therefore it is inconsistent if we accept the paintings inspired by that attitude as expressing the faith that is in us. If we do so, and it leads to subconscious misconceptions as to the nature of God, it is our own fault.

* See Giotto.

A very striking instance of this occurred a few years ago. A mother overheard one of her little daughters rebuking a smaller sister for refusing to say her prayers.

"Nancy, you won't be allowed to go to heaven if you don't," she said, in distress.

"Don't want to go to heaven."

"Oh! Oo—oh! Nancy!" (horrified tones). "Don't you want to be near God in His beautiful kingdom?"

"No. I don't like God."

The little elder sister was quite overcome by this, but the mother waited, for she felt she must know more.

"No. I don't like cross men with beards."

Then the mother understood. It was entirely due to her own mistake in allowing her children to form an impression of the Father from a reproduction of an Italian picture which hung in her dressing-room, not because she regarded it as possessing any religious merit, but because it is an extraordinarily fine piece of composition.

No amount of technical skill can justify an attempt to express the Holiest, and even the earthly body of Christ cannot be represented by a painter who is not, metaphorically, upon his knees, without grave risk of harming the cause of Christ. The greater the technical skill, the more dangerous the attempt, for it is difficult to over-estimate the mental impression made by a really "telling" picture, and psychologists will doubtless admit that it is an exceedingly long-lived impression. It is the more unfortunate that painters have exercised so much of their really amazing skill on pictures inspired by Sadism. Tormented bodies certainly offer considerable scope for the display of masterly treatment, but it may be doubted whether the reaction they produce is beneficial from the spiritual standpoint. They very seldom purify the soul by pity and terror: much more often they arouse a certain impatience in the mind of the spectator of which he is half ashamed. Baccio della Porta (the painter known to us as Fra Bartolommeo) preached eloquently on the power of Art and the necessity of using it to produce a right effect on the mind of the spectator, and we find that he, the Della Robbias, Lorenzo di Credi, and Botticelli, really do keep up a very high spiritual level in Art, all of them being men who were strongly influenced by Savonarola; but the spirit of the age was tending more and more towards pictures, gorgeous in themselves, which glorified physical beauty, and demonstrated the perfection of technical ability, without suggesting any fine spiritual qualities at all.

Francia is notably an exception to most of the above remarks. His colour is pure and rich, his modelling and compo-

sition as good as anybody's, but it is the devout soul of the picture that attracts. His Pietà, now replaced in its original position on the top of a big altar-piece, is sublime. However correct the move may be, it is, for practical purposes, a misfortune, for before that it hung in a quiet corner where visitors to the National Gallery could, and did, look long at it, drinking in the noble beauty of it, afterwards passing on silent and very grave.

Is there in all the world a more dignified representation of holy sorrow ? It differs little at the first glance from hundreds of pictures treating of the same subject. Mary bends over the dead body of her divine Son, lately tortured, now at rest; but there is a quietness about this particular picture, a tender reverence, that does one good. It is at the opposite pole to those pictures which simply insist on every circumstance of physical horror, and such exist by the thousand. At the Louvre alone there seem to be endless ones of " The Descent from the Cross," and " St. Sebastian," yet it is very seldom that the sight-seer is even faintly moved to pity or awe, or, indeed, to any emotion save one of irritation. There is, however, in Paris one such picture which undoubtedly attains its end, and that is at the Luxembourg. It emphasizes the torments lately endured by the splendid young body, it draws our attention to the agonized expression of the Mother weeping over her Son, and it turns towards us the beautiful and holy face of the Christ, relaxed in death, the mouth open in weakness, not in power. It is very striking and terrible. I saw a woman who came sauntering past it stop suddenly, gasp, and burst into tears. That picture makes visible the potentialities for grief that lie at the bottom of every loving woman's heart. Any mother who gazes with tender pride at the active little body of her babe, is linked to the Mater Dolorosa by the foreboding that haunts her of the day when that lovely body will surely know suffering and death.

But M. Ferrier's picture, though marvellously good of its kind, does not in all probability help many souls. It might break up a hard nature, and allow divine grace to get at the soil, but it would not help one already devout. It does not tend to restrain grief, to dignify, to soothe it. It rather tends to accentuate it.

A painter who induces a gentle, reflective, half-melancholy frame of mind is Bernardino Luini, but this is not always because he himself has a strong grasp of the spiritual facts he depicts. His picture of the Saviour holding a crystal globe is exceedingly beautiful, but so also is his " Salome " with the head of St. John the Baptist. His little Salome might perfectly well be St.

Cecilia wrapt in a dream of heavenly music. She has the wistful charm of a Botticelli and more actual beauty of feature.

Correggio . . . Veronese . . . Murillo . . . names connected with paintings of religious subjects, yet they fail to suggest, for the most part, any genuine spiritual appeal. Murillo's "Virgin of the Assumption" is no more the holy Mother than the crescent moon on which she stands could be a real moon. It is a theatrical property moon, and the whole handsome picture smells of the footlights.

How many more strike one as being stagy, artificial. They are manifestly arranged to the best advantage; they have not the supreme grace of simplicity. In Raphael's greatest pictures we are so delighted with the wonderful, clear beauty of the colour and the harmony of the lines that we do not complain that the figures are so often "arranged." There is a saving touch of naïveté about their very arrangement; but this is lacking in Rubens, Veronese, and other painters of extraordinary genius, who are not at their best when the subject calls for spirituality. They can all make a fine picture tell a tale in paint, show us faultlessly executed human figures in all kinds of positions, but they cannot touch the heart. Even in the engagingly honest early Flemish and Italian pictures it is generally some subordinate character who really appeals to us. Mantegna's "Virgin of Victory" is a striking example of this. The principal figures are conventional, even rather wooden, but Gonzago, Lord of Mantua, who is giving thanks to our Lady of Victory, is bubbling over with rapture and thankfulness and general satisfaction. He is on his knees, gazing upward with bright eyes and a most infectious little smile of pure joy. His old mother (it must be his mother) kneels, too, but she does not gaze at the Madonna or her Child, for she is absorbed in watching Gonzago, happy in his happiness.

For pictures that show a passionate desire to exhibit the mercy of Christ and the need of man we need not look far afield. One of the most poignant of these was painted during the war, and few English people can have missed seeing it. No amount of popularity could ever vulgarize it. Who will forget the young soldier sleeping peacefully in death at the feet of the Crucified, one lifeless hand touching, as if in a last appeal of Faith to Love, the pierced feet?

Frank Dicksee, R.A., made two notable attempts to speak to the conscience of men through his rich and ornate art, and the writer well remembers the impression made a great many years ago upon a very small child by his picture of a ragged old palmer holding up a crucifix to attract the attention of some magnificent young Florentines, who are thinking about

anything else in the world but that. "Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?" But of all the painters of this era, one stands alone. His strange, putty-like pigment, his often over-large figures, his want of richness, of colour, cannot disguise the fact that G. F. Watts stands alone. Seer-like, he is concerned with spiritual life, and only with the flesh as it is a vehicle for the spirit. Life, Death, Hope, Innocence, Faith, Conscience, Love . . . these he endeavours to present to us as truly as he can. Was there ever, since our Master Himself spoke, a more tremendous indictment of the spirit of this world than his picture of "Mammon"? The monstrous, hideous, gorgeously clad creature is as stupid as it is powerful for evil. It crushes, torments, kills, in mere careless selfishness. It does not plan to do this, but it does it, because it is spiritually blind and deaf, being without the illumination of the Holy Spirit of God.

Watts may well be considered an Apostle in paint, "born out of due time," but none the less one of that little band of those who spread the truth in a world that sorely needed it.

C. HANSEN BAY.

ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS (I.)

CREIGHTON is reported to have said that the hardening of the pastoral discipline of the Church into a system of Canon Law was one of the gravest disasters that had befallen Christendom. I have looked in vain for this peremptory judgment in his published works, but there is something not unlike it in the Hulsean lectures on Persecution and Tolerance. There he remarks that in the course of time "Penance became a system, and the Church framed her law books after the model of the State. . . . Thus the Church developed a judicial system of her own, and became familiar with a legal procedure which owed much to the State and reacted upon it. Thus it was that the Church became in its organization to a great extent the counterpart of the world."

That may seem sufficiently damnatory, though the facts are stated with all the detachment of the historian. There was a change of method, which was also something more. The new method was perfected in the course of the twelfth century, owing much to the study of the Roman *Ius Civile*, revived in the University of Bologna. Bishops, Archdeacons, and even Rural Deans, set up formal courts, with apparatus and procedure modelled on the civil law, which drew to themselves the whole administration of the Church. A single term illustrates the character of the system. The presiding officer of the court, whatever his spiritual standing might be, was indiscriminately

described, by a title borrowed from the same source, as *Iudex Ordinarius*. Hence "the Ordinary" of modern ecclesiastical language, whom the unlettered public identifies with difficulty.

The pastor of souls was submerged in the judge. In the course of time he was for the most part ousted from his own court. Officials were appointed as delegates, who subsequently became themselves *iudices ordinarii* with an independent standing, and used in their own right the powers derived from their superiors. From an early date in the thirteenth century a Bishop was understood to be obliged to appoint a Vicar-General and Official-Principal of this kind, and in some English dioceses the terms of his appointment precluded the Bishop from sitting personally to hear and determine causes. The system had grown up so rapidly that in the Lateran Council of 1215 it was recognized as completely in possession, and was regulated with considerable care. The regulations imposed were admirable, as were many of later date added by papal authority, and the whole jurisprudence of modern Europe is deeply indebted to them. This should not be disputed. Whether they were congruous to the spiritual life of the Church, whether the Gospel could be so reduced to law without serious loss, is another question.

The courts were always busy, and their practice was lucrative. They dealt with various matters which seem to us remote from the pastoral care of the Church. In some ways their activity was beneficent, tempering the rough justice of kings and magistrates, or providing what it lacked. In so far as they withdrew the clergy of all ranks—an immense number of persons—from the criminal jurisprudence of the time, claiming the right to visit their offences only with spiritual censures, they established an odious privilege which was scandalously abused; but they did diminish the worse evil of crude investigation and of barbarous punishments. By securing the control of almost all matrimonial questions, they delivered Europe from a sort of moral chaos, but at the cost of compromises which impaired their own morality. In England they appropriated the guardianship of testamentary dispositions, and here their record was good. Apart from these foreign issues, the domestic troubles of the Church were their immediate concern. They administered penitential discipline; and it was by means of this that the net of their jurisdiction was flung so wide. Everything which could be made a matter of conscience came within their ken. But here, precisely, was the disaster.

It has often been supposed that public penance in the earlier ages of the Church had the character of a criminal law, designed for the good estate of the community. Creighton himself,

whose acquaintance with the Fathers was not to be compared with his knowledge of medieval conditions, fell into this mistake. In close connection with the passage quoted above he wrote: "At first excommunication, or the withdrawal of the privileges of Church membership, was a necessary protection for the purity of the Christian body. The man whose life did not correspond to his profession, and who by open sin brought discredit on the community, was by solemn sentence put outside the fold. If he repented, made satisfaction, and by public penance gave token of the sincerity of his repentance, he might be again restored to communion." But only the Cathari, the Donatists, and others who denied or restricted the right of the Church to absolve penitents, argued in this fashion. Those who upheld that right, and gradually enlarged it to the admission of repeated penances and absolutions, laid all stress on the penitential discipline as a means of saving sinners, and argued against their opponents expressly on the ground that refusal of penance and restoration was the abandonment of souls to despair. The discipline was essentially sacramental, a ministry of grace. This conception was not wholly lost when the discipline hardened into a judicial process. It is true that absolution given by a priest to a penitent, privately confessing, was now alone called expressly the sacrament of penance; but all proceedings against delinquents in the ecclesiastical courts were formally instituted *pro salute animæ*, and not for the common good. Many details of procedure were based on this principle, and notably the practice of removing censures on satisfactory proof of repentance. This may have made the process against criminous clerks less efficient, and justified a refusal to exempt them from the jurisdiction of secular tribunals, but in some measure it guarded the religious character of the "Court Christian."

That character rapidly deteriorated. The conversion of pastoral discipline into judicial procedure, if tolerable in the abstract, is condemned by its results. The ecclesiastical courts became justly odious. Allowance made for the general unfairness of satire, it cannot be denied that the anger and contempt expressed by divers writers, from Chaucer to Dickens, indicates an evil state of things. But popular works of imagination are not the only evidence. Search of records belonging to the fifteenth century exposes the most unsavoury details. A certain strain of dishonesty in the English Reformation is illustrated by the fact that men who denounced abuses far less flagrant left this evil untouched. The ecclesiastical courts continued in function as a *damnosa hæreditas* from the Middle Ages. The few changes made in the sixteenth century served only to

diminish their spiritual aspect. The Ordinary Judges had hitherto been clergymen of a sort, even if only in minor orders, and so had retained some semblance of pastoral rule; their office was now opened to laymen, who gradually predominated. Two more important changes, one of theory and the other of practice, increased the confusion. Crown lawyers invented the fiction that the ecclesiastical courts, though acting in the name of Bishops and spiritual pastors, derived their authority from the King—a contention justified by much of the business with which they dealt, but fatal to their character as administering spiritual discipline. This theoretic attack was intensified by the institution of a formal appeal from the highest of them to the King in person, who appointed Delegates to hear and determine the appeals. The fact that the Delegates were usually chosen from among the Doctors of Law who practised in the spiritual courts did not alter their character as representatives exclusively of the Crown.

With these few changes the medieval system went on, abusive as before. The Court of King's Bench, under the leadership of Sir Edward Coke, pruned the abuses by Writ of Prohibition, but only in such a way as to impair the efficiency of the Ordinaries without improving their methods. Those methods shared with the greater tyranny of the High Commission the chief responsibility for the general hatred which fell upon the Church in the seventeenth century, and one of the first acts of the Long Parliament was to forbid almost the whole exercise of the customary ecclesiastical discipline. To this onslaught the Bishops yielded, only to be ruined conclusively in the following year. The disabling Act was amended at the Restoration, and the spiritual courts resumed their functions, with one notable exception. Procedure by oath *ex officio* was still forbidden. It had been gravely abused, but, more than anything else done in these tribunals, it had some savour of the ancient penance; the peculiarity of it was that the Ordinary himself, without the intervention of an accuser, cited before him anyone suspected of malpractices, and examined him on oath. A procedure tolerable in the hands of a genuinely pastoral authority was odious when administered judicially as a criminal prosecution, and it could not be endured in the courts as now constituted. This being abolished, the ecclesiastical courts could only hear complaints *inter partes*, and were thus further reduced to a narrow legalism.

So they continued through the eighteenth century. A perusal of Oughton's *Ordo Iudiciorum* will show them at their work. Their nerve-centre, the society of *Iurisperiti* at Doctors' Commons, was eminently respectable, and their practice was

illustrated by such distinguished jurists as Lord Stowell, but the original vice of the institution had become inveterate. One valuable reform, however, was effected early in the nineteenth century. The gravest scandal inherited from the Middle Ages was the abuse of excommunication. This ultimate censure, the last word of penitential discipline, to be uttered according to ancient rule by none but the chief pastor of souls, and by him only in the last resort against obstinate sinners, was degraded into an instrument for enforcing obedience to the most trifling interlocutory decrees of an Ordinary who might be a clerk of the first tonsure, and from him the abuse of power descended to the laymen who are his modern successors. It might be supposed that delinquents would laugh at such a mockery. Apparently they did, for the sentence was found inoperative, and the aid of the civil arm was invoked to make the system workable. The Ordinary thus flouted certified to the King's Chancery the censure pronounced, and a writ *de excommunicato capiendo* was forthwith issued, under which the recalcitrant offender was laid in prison until he should repent and obtain absolution. This travesty of spiritual censure continued until the year 1813, when certain Evangelical Churchmen, who had great influence with Lord Liverpool's Ministry, procured its abolition, and the substitution of a writ *de contumace capiendo* of the same practical effect. The Ordinary had now to certify only that the offender was contumaciously disregarding an order of the court, and imprisonment followed until he had submitted with promise of obedience or was otherwise discharged from the liability. The practical difference was small; censures purporting to be spiritual were still enforced by a temporal penalty, but there was one gross indecency the less.

In the year 1833 another change was made. Appeals to the Crown were transferred from the Court of Delegates to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Acute controversy about some judgments of this tribunal has given factitious interest to the transfer. The Judicial Committee was precisely what the Delegates had been, a body representing the authority of the Crown and nothing else. In some respects the change was salutary, for the new tribunal brought about, by scathing observations in the hearing of appeals, certain improvements in the methods of Doctors' Commons.

In 1840 a vital reform was attempted. The purpose of the Church Discipline Act of that year was to bring back the Bishop to his proper position as the minister of spiritual discipline, at least in relation to the clergy. This excellent intention was frustrated by the retention of much machinery of the courts, especially of the appellate courts in both provinces,

and of the Judicial Committee in final appeal. Bishops have seldom used the powers which they were set free to exercise, and they have used them subject to those appeals which perpetuate the fundamental falsities of the whole system of courts.

It is barely necessary to mention the removal of matrimonial and testamentary causes from the ecclesiastical courts in 1857 and the dissolution of the society of Doctors' Commons which ensued.

In the meanwhile a succession of appeals to the Judicial Committee in matters of doctrine and worship had brought to the front the whole question of the authority of the courts. At first the Judicial Committee alone was challenged, as being evidently a civil and not an ecclesiastical institution. "If the Church of England does not destroy the Judicial Committee," said Keble, "the Judicial Committee will destroy the Church of England."

Much later it was discovered that the ecclesiastical courts themselves, partly because of their subjection to the Judicial Committee, partly because of their own internal defects, lacked any authority which could command the obedience of the faithful. It is open to anyone to say that this discovery would not have been made if the judgments of the courts had not been distasteful to the discoverers. That is probably true, but under that impulse the discovery was made. The abortive Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874 did but sharpen criticism which had been developed a year earlier in a volume of "Essays on Ecclesiastical Reform." The Clergy Discipline Act of 1892 and the Benefices Act of 1898 encountered less active opposition because they dealt with matters about which there was no controversy, but it was noted that they retained the fundamental vices of the existing system.

The criticism directed against the ecclesiastical courts produced a paralysis of discipline, for the effectual exercise of which those courts were the only available instruments. The fact was at length acknowledged by the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, which reported in the year 1906. The Commissioners found the cause partly in "the archaic character of the practice," partly in "the unsuitableness of imprisonment, however inevitable in the last resort, as the direct penalty for refusal to obey ecclesiastical sentences," but chiefly in "the constitution of the Court of Final Appeal for Ecclesiastical Causes." They remarked with justice: "A court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must, above all others, rest on moral authority if its judgments are to be effective. As thousands of clergy, with strong lay support, refuse to recognize the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee,

its judgments cannot practically be enforced." But this is not the only result. They add: "The failure of the Court of Final Appeal to command the obedience of the clergy is a source of inevitable weakness in the Provincial and Diocesan Courts. It is objected that these courts are bound to adopt the rulings of the Crown Court which hears appeals from them."

To remedy this disastrous state of things, the Commissioners recommended certain reforms in the ecclesiastical judicature. But the recommendations do not go to the root of the matter. They retain the final appeal to the Judicial Committee, requiring only the reference of "any question touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England" to "an assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces," unless, indeed, it be a question "in the opinion of the court governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament." That is to say, the Judicial Committee is to judge unless it is itself in doubt. But the objections to this tribunal are not based on the personal incompetence of its members; they are based on its entire lack of spiritual or ecclesiastical character. The proposed reforms of the inferior courts are equally inadequate. Recognition is refused them, not because of their "archaic character," but because they have lost whatever spiritual and ecclesiastical character they may once have had, and more fundamentally because of the profound impropriety of placing spiritual discipline in the hands of lawyers working on the lines of legal procedure. The proposed reforms would perpetuate the evils which they are intended to remedy.

It is doubtless because of the inadequacy of these recommendations that they have been left sleeping for seventeen years, and the Church remains without effective discipline. A demand for the reform of Church Courts is now again being heard. Is it not possible to think of a more excellent way?

T. A. Lacey.

(To be continued.)

FROM ST. MATTHEW TO ST. LUKE

The most important criticism, as it seems to me, which has ever been offered upon the non-Marcan sayings common to St. Luke and St. Matthew is that of Weizsäcker, who points out that St. Matthew's order is far more likely to reproduce that of the common source, inasmuch as it corresponds exactly to the needs of the Christian community in the very earliest times. This is obviously true of the three great discourses of St. Matthew with which I propose to deal in this paper. The Sermon on the Mount is a statement of the Christian Way; directly Christianity

came into existence, Christians would require a statement of the Way. Matthew x., with its encouragements and warnings in a time of persecution, would be needed as soon as persecution began. The great collection of eschatological sayings and parables, which seems to form a single block with the denunciations of the Pharisees in Matthew xxiii. to xxv., satisfies needs which would be felt when first the new society found itself face to face with contemporary Judaism eagerly expecting our Lord's Second Coming.

There are, however, two distinctions which ought to be drawn between these collections. The Sermon on the Mount and Matthew xxiii. are coherent artistic unities. The formation of Matthew x. or of the eschatological block apart from Matthew xxiii. is comparatively loose. It follows from this difference that a theory of apostolic compilation which is adequate to account for the second of the two groups fails to explain the unity of the Sermon or of Matthew xxiii.; that unity can only be accounted for on the hypothesis that the Apostles who effected the compilation were building upon previous connected statements on the characteristics of the disciples and the shortcomings of Pharisaism drawn up by our Lord Himself and memorized by His original followers. The mention of memorizing leads us, however, to a second distinction. Memorizing takes time. The eschatological statements which presumably were made by our Lord at the very close of His Ministry could hardly for that very reason have been learned by heart, and thus in all probability are not preserved for us with the same accuracy as the rest of the matter with which we are dealing; and the same reservation is doubtless partially applicable to the sayings on the subject of persecution.

If, however, these three groups, whatever the variations in their value, were indeed drawn up by the Apostles in the very earliest times, it is highly improbable that any later writer, even St. Luke, would ever really succeed in going behind them. He might discern, as we have done, that the unity of Matthew x. need not go back to a connected discourse of our Lord's, but his effort to find contexts for the various sayings would be necessarily doomed to failure from the outset.

The main object of the present paper is to show that from the mere existence of these groups of sayings we can account for the so-called " Peræan section " or " greater interpolation " of St. Luke. But before making this attempt, it may be well to point out how carefully St. Luke, in spite of his separation of the groups into their elements and in spite of his interlacing of group with group, nevertheless retains the internal order within each collection.

(*a*) His observance of St. Matthew's order in the eschatological collection has been remarked upon already by Canon Box, who has drawn up a table of correspondences as follows:

Matthew.	Luke.
Woes against Pharisees, xxiii. 1-36.	Woes against Pharisees, xi. 39-52.
Jerusalem, Jerusalem, xxiii. 37-39.	The day of the Lord as a thief and the two stewards, xii. 39 *ff.*
False Christs and the Parousia, xxiv. 26-28, and 37-41.	Jerusalem, Jerusalem, xiii. 34 *f.*
The day of the Lord as a thief, and the two stewards, xxiv. 43 *f.*	False Christs and the Parousia, xvii. 23-27.
Parable of the talents, xxv. 14-30.	Parable of the pounds, xix. 12-27.

Of five passages in St. Luke, only one disturbs St. Matthew's order.

The point of most interest is the separation of the apostrophe to Jerusalem from the woes. Luke's special source, careful to associate the childhood of our Lord and of John the Baptist with the temple, careful to substitute a weeping over Jerusalem for the symbolic cursing of the fig-tree or to replace the cursing by a parable, careful to omit the allegation of the witnesses that Christ had threatened to destroy and rebuild the temple, careful to make Jerusalem the exclusive scene of the resurrection-appearances, was in all probability a Jerusalem document, and has isolated the apostrophe to Jerusalem for purposes of special explanation. We find it accordingly in a chapter which begins by showing that Galilee, as well as Jerusalem, stands in need of repentance, which includes the parable of the fig-tree capable with time and care of yet being restored to fruitfulness, and which ends by putting the apostrophe side by side with our Lord's declaration that the privilege of Galilee as the scene of our Lord's Ministry would avail nothing in the judgment if Galilee were disobedient. At the same time, since it is to Pharisees, if friendly Pharisees, that the apostrophe to Jerusalem is addressed, we find St. Luke practically acknowledging that St. Matthew is right in appending the apostrophe to the woes.

(*b*) The correspondence between the Evangelists is even more complete in the case of the encouragements and warnings from Matthew x. Luke xii. 2-9, xii. 51-53, xiv. 26, 27, xvii. 33, represent Matthew x. 26-39 broken up into pieces. As Harnack says, the phenomena can only be explained if the order of St. Matthew is the order of the source; and he adds that we are here given a typical instance of St. Luke's procedure.

(*c*) It would, of course, be almost impossible to apply the interlacing process rigidly to three discourses. If, moreover,

the Sermon on the Mount was really the early "disciples' manual" of the primitive community, texts from it would be always on everybody's lips ready for quotation on every possible occasion; it would thus be only to be expected that St. Luke should put some of the sayings out of St. Matthew's order. The remarkable thing, however, is that if we confine our attention to extracts of any length, then even here St. Luke seems to follow St. Matthew, since the Lord's Prayer, the main passage on trust and wealth, the Narrow Gate and Shut Door, appear in three successive chapters of St. Luke (xi., xii., xiii.) just as they came in Matt. vi. 9 *ff*, vi. 19 *ff*, vii. 13 *f*, 21 *f*.

Moreover, there is a resemblance in Luke's dealings with Matthew x. and with the Sermon which shows him to be acting in accordance with a recipe or plan. In either case he gives a shorter discourse more or less corresponding to St. Matthew's, and then anticipates St. Matthew's close to bring his own composition to an end. Similar evidence of a deliberately adopted plan is to be found in the way in which St. Luke (or probably his Jerusalem source) treats the extracts from the Sermon. The Lord's Prayer follows the episode of Martha and Mary, which has always been regarded as a little lesson on the subject of prayer; and the teaching on trust and wealth follows on the parable of the Rich Fool, which (like the later parables of the Unjust Steward and of Dives and Lazarus) seems intended to explain what our Lord meant when He said: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth . . . lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven."

Thus we may say on the whole that St. Luke interlaces the three principal discourses of St. Matthew, together with special material of his own, without disturbing more than he can help the order of the common source. We come now to our subject proper. I think it can be shown that the theory on which St. Luke's greater interpolation appears to be founded, the theory that the last journey to Jerusalem was accompanied by the delivery of our Lord's principal teaching, might arise very naturally from the mere existence of these three great collections of sayings. The process would begin with the endeavour to find a proper setting for the delivery of the sayings combined in the eschatological block Matt. xxiii.-xxv. On the one hand they could not have been uttered at Jerusalem, since it was known that, as Sir John Hawkins and B. Weiss tell us was the case, the non-Marcan common sayings are all prior to Holy Week. On the other hand, these eschatological sayings are so obviously late that tradition would tend to put them as late as could be managed. The occasion which would inevitably suggest itself would thus be the last journey. The next stage in the growth of the tradition would come about directly men

perceived that many of the sayings in that artificially produced combination, Matthew x., were also of an eschatological nature; since persecution and division were the supposed accompaniments of, or preludes to, the expected end. Lastly it would be seen that even in the Sermon on the Mount there were sayings of an eschatological character. There were, for instance, the utterances about the Narrow Way and the Shut Door. The Lord's Prayer was at least to some extent eschatological. Matthew v. 25, 26 ("agree with thine adversary quickly . . ."), was susceptible of interpretation on eschatological lines. . . .

Whether the passage on trust and wealth was regarded as eschatological may be left an open question. It could, of course, have been argued that the renunciation of wealth was in itself the strait way of entrance into the kingdom. But it is more probable, perhaps, that Luke's Jerusalem sources had segregated the teaching on wealth from the Sermon because wealth was one of Jerusalem's very special interests.

For those of us who are distrustful of attempts to penetrate to the sources which underlie the Gospels, it is perhaps by their treatment of the topic of wealth that the comparative claims of St. Matthew and St. Luke can most easily be evaluated. If our Lord's teaching were confined to the more or less enigmatic passage in the Sermon, then we can understand Jerusalem on the strength of that passage instituting the community of goods. St. Luke evidently regards that passage as of crucial importance. Every text from Matt. vi. 19-34 is more or less reproduced in four different contexts, a proof that the subject has received a very particular attention. The opening, however, "lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," is not so much quoted as paraphrased (Luke xii. 33, 34); and it is no longer the opening, it is rendered less emphatic by being made to follow on Matt. vi. 25-33. A looser rendering of the thought appears in Luke xii. 21, and a further paraphrastic variant in Luke xvi. 9. Then, too, as we mentioned above, there are three parables supplied to explain the same saying. Further, as if expressly to call in question the communistic interpretation, our Lord is made (Luke xii. 13 *ff*) indignantly to refuse the office of a judge or a divider. Our Lord's teaching is explained in the two chapters xii. and xvi. as deprecating covetousness, as inculcating almsgiving, as insisting on the duty of regarding wealth as a trust. All the principles attributed to our Lord are doubtless ethically sound. But one cannot help feeling, as I say, that if He had really enunciated them quite so clearly and definitely, Jerusalem would never have begun its ecclesiastical history by establishing communism.

Thus the interlacing of the three discourses by St. Luke is complicated in practice by the weight which he attaches to

the document in which Jerusalem seeks to develop our Lord's teaching on the lines of its own special interests. We have seen that this explains the removal of the apostrophe to Jerusalem from its proper place at the close of the denunciations of the Pharisees. We now see that it explains also the separation of the passage on wealth from the Sermon on the Mount. Yet it remains incontestable that for an authentic rendering of our Lord's actual teaching our best authority is St. Matthew. St. Luke, as Weizsäcker pointed out, satisfies the needs, and answers the questions, of a rather later age. If to put a note of interrogation to so many passages seems a little drastic, we must remember that reverence for our Lord ought to make us very suspicious of sayings which claim to be His, very ready to reject all that is not most unmistakably the purest gold.

I have just been reading a book which seems to be destined to mark an epoch, Mr. Jameson's *Origin of the Synoptic Gospels*.* The author seems to demonstrate conclusively that Luke knew and used Matthew. I do not, however, feel that such a discovery removes the necessity of such a modified Q as we have in this paper taken over from Weizsäcker. Even if Luke used Matthew, the probability remains that the Apostles should reproduce with a few minor additions our Lord's Manual of discipleship, or collect His warnings and encouragements to the persecuted, or publish His denunciations of the Pharisees, together with what they seemed to remember of His predictions of the End. However high a view we form of Matthew the occasions which he assigns to the blocks of discourse continue to be artificial, the date of the Sermon on the Mount continues to seem too early; and the differences which we observed in the matter of artistic unity and logical coherence still distinguish the Sermon on the Mount and the Denunciations from the other collected sayings. Above all, it was the knowledge that the grouping had in some cases been effected by the Apostles that emboldened St. Luke or his Jerusalem source to take such liberties in the work of rearrangement; it was just because the eschatological block and the persecution block floated in the air without any definite or convincing point of attachment that the theory of the teaching on the road to Jerusalem came to be entertained.

It only remains to be said that the questions mooted in this paper possess more than a theoretic interest. The acceptance of Matthew's Sermon in any real sense involves the corollary that our Lord Himself entertained the project of founding a Church, that the origin of the Christian Society has to be put back to the Galilean Ministry.

VIVIAN MACMUNN.

* We publish below a notice of this book by Canon Streeter.—ED.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE *Times Literary Supplement* of June 14 contained the announcement of reduction in price from sixpence to threepence. This will bring it within reach of many more readers, and we think that some of our own subscribers, overseas as well as at home, may be glad to know of it.

We have received the following comment on the Bishop of Ontario's article in our May number.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THEOLOGY."

SIR,—In the current number of THEOLOGY I have just read an article by the Bishop of Ontario entitled "Fair Play in Controversy."

The Bishop takes exception to some comments which I made, in my book *Shaken Creeds*, upon an article which he had contributed to the *Hibbert Journal* of April, 1922. I am extremely sorry to have hurt the Bishop's feelings, and I hope he will accept my assurance that I made no charge against his personal honesty, and that he will, by kindly re-reading the offending paragraph, satisfy himself that no such implication is conveyed to the reader. For my contention throughout the chapter to which the Bishop refers is that perfectly honourable men, such as the Bishop and others whose words I also quote, habitually use expressions to which they assign meanings other than the literal meanings; and I express my opinion that "the plain man" of whom the Bishop speaks would, if he realized that this was the case, consider this grossly dishonest. I, in common with other students of theological controversies, know that many of the clergy use these expressions symbolically, and that they have convinced themselves that they are honestly entitled to do so; but surely it cannot be denied that these "plain" folk who are "ignorant of theological speculations" would consider it dishonest if they knew that something which is affirmed as a fact is believed only as a metaphor.

The Bishop stated that "the plain man" was "well aware that the Ascension into Heaven and the Session at the right hand of God can only be symbolic representations of the truths they are intended to convey," but he appealed for the retention of that and other credal clauses on the grounds of ecclesiastical expediency. If I did him an injustice in my remarks about "flimsy evidence," I apologise, but his article in the *Hibbert* left me under the impression that other doctrines were also regarded by him as symbolic. For, at least so it seemed to me, if doctrines are defensible in their ancient and literal meanings, the question of ecclesiastical policy does not arise, and an argument to demonstrate their truth would be preferred before an argument to demonstrate their utility. I have no quarrel with and feel no animus against Bishops or against anybody else whose opinions differ from my own, and I do not think that any other reader of *Shaken Creeds* will have discovered that "evident rancour" to which Dr. Bidwell alludes, but I think I am entitled to criticise the attitude of those who use symbolically and metaphorically expressions which were originally intended, and are now accepted by most congregations, as literal descriptions of historic events.

JOCELYN RHYS.

June 12, 1923.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S RELIGION SEEN THROUGH GERMAN EYES

Lately the Prussian education authorities issued a memorandum on the study of foreign countries, urging the intensive study of their national characteristics. England and America, especially, deserve attention. Germany has had to pay heavily for her ignorance of Anglo-Saxon mentality during the war and for her under-estimate of British tenacity. Those who knew English literature best were most deceived. Clearly there is something in English life which cannot be learned from books. Much is inexplicable—so apparently irrational an institution as the English Sunday, for example—unless one has lived in England or had an English wife to explain it. Religion plays a most important part in English life, and must not be neglected in any series of books intended to enlighten the German reader.

Such is Herr Baumgarten's account of the genesis of his book,* which forms part of a series intended to meet the requirements of the Prussian authorities. According to a reviewer in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* no one in Germany is so qualified as he for the task. We shall do well to study his conclusions carefully. In spite of some ludicrous misapprehensions the book is in the main sensible and the standpoint is so novel that pleasant surprises occur on nearly every page. The method is *echt deutsch*. Observations made from the outside during a long residence among us are checked and reinforced by what can be gleaned from books. But perhaps a foreigner must always miss the *imponderabilia*. Thus the account of the Salvation Army is taken largely from General Booth's *In Darkest England*, and the author fails to realize that much of its programme never got beyond the paper stage and that the much-advertised Salvationist measures of social regeneration are trivial in extent compared with the manifold agencies of the older religious bodies. This is perhaps excusable, but the elucidation of "average State-Church piety" from the pages of *Scenes from Clerical Life* reminds one of the fabled Oxford undergraduate, whose surprising knowledge of the working man was attributed to "a hasty generalization from his scout." We are carefully sorted out into different types and given marks. Thus a special characteristic of the High Church movement is its work in East London, though in parishes like Bermondsey and Bethnal Green the Evangelicals can show results probably more impressive. But we had rather learn from this sincere and conscientious writer than criticize him. Looking at England afresh after the war years what does he find?

On the whole he finds more to praise in English than in German religion. Self-righteousness is the national vice, which religion does not cure. But the practical nature of English Church life is very impressive to a foreigner. Every denomination has its social work and its busy parochial activities, with the result that the little man, especially in the chapels, finds himself a person of importance with a place to fill. We deplore the alienation of the working class; this German observer is surprised at the extent of their adhesion to organized religion. One Church, by the way, is entirely omitted from the survey—the Roman Catholic. Probably the author feels that the English Romanists are not characteristically English, and can be studied sufficiently well in Germany.

* *Religiöses und Kirchliches Leben in England*, von Otto Baumgarten. Teubner, Leipzig, 1922. English price, about 3s. 6d.

After a preliminary sketch of English Church history come two chapters on the average religion of the "State-Church"* and Nonconformity. Great emphasis is laid upon the Book of Common Prayer. Nowhere else in the literature of any people exists such a book, written in solemn and beautiful language, in the mother-tongue, and repeated constantly for nearly four centuries until it has become a national possession. Through the Prayer Book a knowledge of the Bible is assured to the ordinary man and the general culture of the nation is lifted on to a high level. The State-Church is not unpopular with the masses as it is in Germany; the steady interest of Churchpeople in social questions is a safeguard, and there has been no repression of the workers' aspirations by the State to bring odium on the Church associated most closely with the State. Preaching is marked by assertion rather than rational proof. Little attempt is made to bring the spirit of the Sunday services into the affairs of the week. The miseries of the lowest section of the population, which find no parallel in Germany,† fail to disturb the equanimity of churchgoers, who are equally undisturbed by the divergence between Imperialism and the Sermon on the Mount. Taking all the Bible as equally inspired, they unconsciously appropriate to the world-enterprises of their race the Old Testament idea of a chosen people.

Nonconformity is treated under the heading "der kleinkirchliche Typus"—the reader will go astray if he imagines sectarianism in the German sense—less sympathetically. Herr Baumgarten accuses its adherents of "cant." Their tremendous missionary enthusiasm is the projection into the religious sphere of the boundless desire for world-domination of an imperial race; the hypocrisy is quite unconscious. Worship consists largely of hymns, to the German mind intolerably subjective, which reflect the experience of a few, and when sung by crowds are cant. "To the Free Churches in general any earnest reckoning with science and rational thinking is alien; a scientific theology is almost completely lacking or is limited to archæology; modern philosophy and art are disregarded."

The chapter on the High Church type is very interesting. The movement is unlikely to end in the bosom of Rome; it is a genuinely English expression of the national love for old and beautiful forms, which appears elsewhere in devotion to family-trees. The justification of usages merely because they are traditional strikes Protestants as almost comic. The movement has developed no characteristic theology, for its energies have been dissipated in archaisms. Herr Baumgarten cannot overpraise the beauty and impressiveness of our services, especially at St. Paul's and Cowley, or the splendour of our restored Cathedrals. The Mass, as it is now called, is the centre of worship. All spiritual jurisdiction comes from the hierarchy. The movement makes its strongest appeal to the "high-tories," who, unlike the Prussian Junkers, do not interpret "Throne and Altar" as meaning the subordination of Altar. But it is democratic and reaches out in loving devotion to the very poor. Our author is specially impressed by the fact that people of good family sing in the choir. He pays a tribute to "der feinsinnige, ritualistische Bischof von

* The common German usage, which designates the Church of England "die Hochkirche," is corrected.

† Probably the author would not mean this to apply to post-war conditions. Another recent writer refers to the English "Not," and says, "Would we had it in Germany!"

London." He warns his readers that the movement is an English type of Catholicism and has no Protestant elements.

As one would expect, little sympathy is shown to the Low Church, a title which is said to describe accurately the intellectual and æsthetic achievements of its adherents. The school is based on Bibliolatry and personal devotion to the Saviour. Its members are prone to self-deception; they simply do not know the real state of things as regards the Bible or their own souls. The sketch describes the traditional school only; such developments as "Liberal Evangelicalism" are unknown to the writer.

The Broad Church School is said to appeal most to Germans, because its inspiration has come mainly from Germany, though Judaism and heathen religions have contributed elements.* But with every wish to praise, the book cannot do so whole-heartedly. The Broad Church leaders have always refused to face realities. Instead of building a bridge between this life and the ultimate verities, they shrink from the necessary mental toil and substitute sentiment and poetic fancies. German "hardwood-boring" is not to their taste.

Various non-Anglican types are described. English and Scottish Puritanism differs from German Pietism as active differs from passive. The business-like, bustling, world-envisaging activities of Wesleyans and Baptists cannot be expected to appeal to Germans, who by force of political and economic circumstances are compelled to limit themselves severely. Herr Baumgarten views English Nonconformists unfavourably and pillories their spiritual immodesty, their prying into others' souls and exposing the secrets of their own souls to public gaze, so repugnant to the inwardly modest German. The Quakers, however, meet with warm approval, though he laments the fact that they form a little sect instead of remaining as a leaven in the other communities.

Probably the Germans resent the invasion of English sects such as the Methodists and Salvation Army. At any rate, the latter arouses the author's contempt and indignation. He speaks of the founder's "naïve peasant cunning," and deems the militaristic organization ridiculous—he would prefer the Jesuits any day—and the street praying and testifying shamelessness.

The last chapter describes the common English factors in the different types of piety. These are: (1) Greater knowledge of and respect for the Bible than in Germany, resulting in a higher average level of piety. (2) A strong practical and moralizing tendency, in contrast to the German search after abstract truth; in his analysis of character the English preacher shares the excellence of the English novel. (3) Utilitarianism, shown in the characteristic proverb, "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." (4) A strongly developed sense of form, natural in the oldest of Europe's cultures, which leads the English to embody their ideals at once in appropriate outward forms. (Something similar may be studied in Hamburg, alone of German towns.)

This very original and well-intentioned book ends thus: "However, if we set ourselves against Anglomania, the simple imitation of English forms of piety in German life as an externalizing and endangering of our purer, truer content of life, we should not like this to be our last and concluding word, but rather end with a very earnest request to approach with respect and reverence this fully developed and many-sided embodi-

* The allusion is to the influence of the study of comparative religion by Max Müller and others.

ment of religion in a highly civilized nation, an embodiment so rich in life and outward form, that we may thereby grow in the knowledge of the laws of its life and their varied relations." W. K. L. Clarke.

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the inquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

LETTER ON THE STUDY OF DOGMATICS.

[A young priest in Newfoundland asked for advice on the study of dogma. The following letter was sent:]

To advise a stranger about his studies is at best an unsatisfactory proceeding. All that can safely be done is to put certain considerations before him and leave to him the responsibility of choice. You are isolated in one of the Dominions, have not studied seriously since ordination, and now want advice about the study of dogmatic theology. I am probably right in assuming that to begin with, at any rate, you need all-round enrichment of your knowledge rather than an intensive study of details; that the understanding of the Anglican position is a matter of primary importance to you; and that you cannot afford to spend much on books.

The field to be studied may be divided in a fourfold way:

I. It is essential to study the Anglican position in broad outline. Perhaps one of the books prescribed for your examination will be suitable for intensive study in the light of the practical experience you have now gained. But a new book will probably be more helpful. Bicknell's *A Theological Introduction to the* 39 *Articles* (Longmans, 21s.) is the best single book. This can be supplemented by more popular summaries like Gore's *The Religion of the Church* (Mowbray, 1s. 6d.) and Griffith Thomas's *The Catholic Faith* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.) from the High Church and Evangelical sides. You should compare the statements in the shorter books with their theological bases in Bicknell. You may have many years in the priesthood, and a proper plan for notebooks is highly desirable. It has been said that every priest should make his own *Summa*. At least you might write out your own summaries of doctrine on one side of the page and the passages of the Bible, Fathers, etc., on which they are based on the opposite page.

II. Doctrinal statements can never profitably be isolated from the times in which they were formulated. Therefore Church History must be read by the side of dogma. Three useful little books are Burn on the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds (Rivington, 1s. 6d. each).

Workman's *Christian Thought to the Reformation* (Duckworth, 3s. 6d.) is useful. Swete's *The Apostles' Creed* (Cambridge, 4s.) is all that one would expect from its author. Some first-hand knowledge of ancient authors is exceedingly valuable. Among the S.P.C.K. Texts and Translations the following may be mentioned: *The Didache*, 3d.; *St. Ignatius*, 4s.; *St. Gregory of Nyssa's Catechetical Oration*, 2s.; *The Tome of Leo*, 1s.; *St. Augustine's City of God* (abridged), 3s.—all in English with notes. If you want a big book, Bethune-Baker's *Introduction to Early Christian Doctrine* (Methuen, 15s.) is unsurpassed of its kind.

III. You may prefer to approach the subject from the point of view of modern needs. These arise from modern presuppositions of thought and from controversial exigencies. An admirable treatment of the Creed from a modern standpoint is *The Meaning of the Creed* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.), by the leading theologians of the English Church (detailed bibliography for further study). Dogmatics can hardly be separated from apologetics, for which I suggest Harris's *Pro Fide* (Murray, 10s. 6d.) and Garvie's *A Handbook of Apologetics* (Duckworth, 3s. 6d.); *Lux Mundi* (Murray, 4s. 6d.); Spens's *Belief and Practice* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.).

As to controversy, none of us can escape the Roman controversy. Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is the standard book, but I advise you first to study a book like Faa di Bruno's *Catholic Belief* (Burns and Oates, 1s. 3d.). It is very cheap, and you need not mind marking it. Mark with black ink positions which you cannot accept but do not consider barriers to reunion, and with red ink positions which seem to you insuperable barriers. Consider how you would discuss these points with a parishioner inclined to despair of Anglicanism who was primed with Faa di Bruno's arguments. Then consult Gore.

IV. Some men are so constituted that they prefer to begin with one subject and work round it. Christian dogma is a connected whole, and no one part can be understood without a knowledge of the rest. You would be well advised to supplement your general reading by studying some subject which makes a special appeal to you. Here are some books:

The Holy Trinity. F. J. Hall. Longmans. 9s. (This is one of his big series. If you found the book helpful you could buy others.)

The Person of Christ. Gore. *The Incarnation of the Son of God.* Murray. 4s. 6d.

Ottley. *The Doctrine of the Incarnation.* Methuen. 15s.

The Holy Spirit. Swete. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament.* Macmillan. 8s. 6d.

The Doctrine of Man. Eck. *Sin.* Longmans. 5s.

The Atonement. Mozley. *The Doctrine of the Atonement.* Duckworth. 3s. 6d.

Sparrow-Simpson. *Reconciliation between God and Man.* S.P.C.K. 3s.

The Resurrection. Sparrow-Simpson. *The Resurrection and Modern Thought.* Longmans. 8s.

The Church. Swete. *The Holy Catholic Church.* Macmillan, 4s. 6d.; Longmans, 7s. 6d.

Stone. *The Christian Church.* Rivington. 7s. 6d.

Eschatology. F. J. Hall. Longmans. 9s.

King's College Lectures on Immortality. University of London Press. 6s.

The Eucharist. Gore. *The Body of Christ.* Murray. 4s. 6d.

Marriage. Lacey. *Marriage in Church and State.* Scott. 5s.

PATRISTICA

The *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* continues to make welcome, if somewhat slow, progress; like the Latin *Thesaurus*, it has extended, both in time and bulk, much beyond the original design. At the present rate it is doubtful whether any of the first subscribers will live to see its completion. We are glad, however, to see three new parts, comprising fascicules LVI. (*Infideles, salut des*) to LIX. (*Italie*). Besides the general articles, full and valuable, such as *Inquisition*, *Inspiration de l'Écriture*, etc., the patristic student will welcome several extensive and informative articles in his own field. The most important of these is the bulky article on Irenæus, which occupies columns 2394 to 2533, divided into the four sections: (I.) Life; (II.) Works; (III.) Doctrine; (IV.) Place in the History of Theology. It is impossible here even to summarize an article which runs to such length; those interested in Irenæus will find it a veritable storehouse on every question connected with him. One point may be indicated on which opinion is likely to be divided: the date of the Latin translation; the writer judges that this is " certainly anterior to St. Augustine " (col. 2402), but dismisses the theory, proposed by Dodwell and recently defended by H. Jordan, that the fourth century must be its locus. The last word is not yet spoken on this question; once we have the volume of Irenæus-studies begun in a *seminar* of Dr. Sanday's and edited by Professor C. H. Turner, to be published soon (Oxford), it should be possible to arrive at a decision on this and other problems in Irenæus.

Before leaving these fascicules of the *Dictionnaire*, we may draw attention to the useful articles on Isidore of Seville, Isidore of Pelusium, and especially to the interesting article on the Jew Isaac, the reputed " Ambrosiaster." Here will be found a clear account of the development of the thesis " Ambrosiaster=Isaac "; the question is left open until Father Brewer shall have published his edition of the Ambrosiastrian Commentaries in the Vienna Corpus. While speaking of Ambrosiaster, I may be allowed to refer to a short note which appeared in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January, in which it was pointed out that in 405 Augustine seems to assign these commentaries to St. Ambrose.

It is not too late to give a cordial welcome to Professor Souter's translation of Tertullian *Concerning the Resurrection of the Flesh* (S.P.C.K., 1922, pp. xxiv + 206, 12s. 6d. net). This volume is the most important of the three translations now published by Dr. Souter in the same series, and that not entirely because the *de Carnis Resurrectione* forms perhaps the best introduction to Tertullian; the collation here given of the Troyes MS. of this treatise, now for the first time printed and made available for students, is of itself sufficient to make this volume unique and indispensable. To praise the accuracy and vigour of the translation is unnecessary at this time of the day; but it is probably the collation that will interest most students. Discovered in 1916 at Troyes by Dom Wilmart, this manuscript contains five treatises of Tertullian, including the *de Baptismo*, of which it was believed there was no manuscript in existence. The importance of this happy find it is impossible to exaggerate; Dom Wilmart is greatly to be congratulated on his discovery, and Professor Souter on his excellent and valuable collation of the *de Carnis Resurrec-*

tione. Since the evidence of the Troyes MS. was unknown to Kroymann, the editor of the Tertullian in the Vienna *Corpus*, that edition now requires careful collation with the text furnished in the newly-discovered manuscript. The volume will be of great service to all students of Tertullian; the notes and translation are, as in previous volumes, of much value, while the collation renders it indispensable.

The series of *Texts and Studies* inaugurated by the University of Louvain under the name *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense* has made a most commendable beginning with the two parts of the first volume of Ferd. Cavallera's *S. Jérôme : Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*. At a later date I hope to examine this work more in detail, so for the present it may be enough to commend the book to all interested, and to solicit for his new and very promising series of studies of ecclesiastical history, literature, and doctrine, from the earliest days to the Council of Trent, the warm welcome it deserves.

The celebrations of the St. Jerome anniversary saw the publication of a goodly number of works and studies of varying importance. Among these space must be made for a book of selections from his writings which is too little known so far in Britain: *Florilegium Hieronymianum . . . recensuit adnotationibus auxit Angelus Ficarra* (Augustæ Taurinorum, Societa editrice internat.). This is an excellent body of selections divided into five parts: Scripta Parænetica, Epitaphia, Scripta Historica, Scripta Theologica et Polemica, Scripta Exegetica. The 225 pages provide a very representative collection of passages, which will be of interest not only to those who make it a first introduction to St. Jerome, but to those to whom Jerome is well known. The price is small and the book strongly, if not elegantly bound; altogether, it is a very acceptable publication.

Another Jerome item which is very welcome is Dr. J. M. Harden's edition of the *Psalterium iuxta Hebræos* (S.P.C.K., 1922, pp. xxxi + 196, 10s. net). The text, edited in 1874 by Lagarde, was almost unobtainable and was very dear; Dr. Harden has supplied a felt need, and that in a way which deserves high praise. He has collated a good number, though not all, of the available MSS., though a complete collation would have given the book greater authority and finality. As it stands, the work shows care and thoroughness; Dr. Harden has done his work well within the limits he set himself, and the result is a handsome and valuable addition to the patristic library, for which he is to be thanked.

An interesting and valuable book to which a fuller review will be later devoted is Dr. Jens Nörregaard's *Augustins Bekehrung* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1923, pp. 246). The chief interest of the work is its opposition to many of the theses propounded in 1918 by M. Prosper Alfaric; Nörregaard presents a very telling case, and one which will gain the interest of all Augustinian students. The volume of selections from St. Augustine, translated by the veteran Professor Harnack, will be welcomed by all (*Reflexionen und Maximen*, Mohr); it is an excellent little book, and worth several times its price.

We are very glad to have from the pen of Mr. E. H. Blakeney a serviceable and cheap edition of the Tome of Pope Leo the Great (S.P.C.K., 1923, paper, 1s. net). There is a concise Introduction, presenting the occasion of its writing and a synopsis of the argument; the text is accompanied by an accurate and readable translation, and by brief yet helpful notes. This should be in the hands of all theological students and of all who are

interested in the famous treatise. Mr. Blakeney has given in short form all the help required for its understanding, and he is to be thanked for providing in a handy and attractive form so important a treatise. It is to be hoped that after this good beginning Mr. Blakeney will continue his patristic labours and give us something from Lactantius—say the *Epitome*—some Letters of Jerome, or some of the smaller works of St. Augustine in this convenient and cheap form.

J. H. Baxter.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CHELMSFORD DIOCESAN SYNOD

The Synod has been fully reported in the *Church Times;* but it may be well to add something about its inner movements and motives. It had at least one useful effect. It took the clergy of the Diocese out of the atmosphere of their party assemblies, and compelled them to listen to the ideas of other Schools. This was clearly beneficial. For some statements caused obvious surprise. Views were defended which others thought were dead. The level of the discussion was high. About forty speakers addressed the Synod, and the silent majority recorded their votes.

The questions put to the Synod on Prayer Book Revision were three: whether the Prayer of Consecration now in use should continue to be the only form sanctioned within the English Church; whether the Synod gave "a general approval" to the proposed alternative Service now before the National Assembly; and finally, whether the Synod approved that sanction should be given to a variety of liturgies.

A remarkable feature of the discussion was that no party can be said to have held unanimously together.

On the Evangelical side the fear was expressed that the changes desired by Anglo-Catholics in the Consecration Prayer would "give a lurking place to abuses," and "provide an opportunity for adoration." It was admitted that adoration followed inevitably on belief in the reality of an objective presence of Christ; but it was asserted by some that the only presence of Christ was in the heart of the Communicant. The effect of this assertion was considerably neutralized by a reference to the remarkable words of Dr. Moule (afterwards Bishop of Durham) at the Fulham Conference that "if our eyes could be opened we should see our Lord, not on, but at, the Holy Table, taking the consecrated bread and wine, and giving them to us" (p. 50): language which recognized distinctly a Eucharistic presence of Christ external to the recipient. Some Evangelicals further declared that there is an offering in the Eucharist of ourselves, our alms, and the fruits of the earth, but not of the

Body and Blood of Christ; and that our Lord in the Institution did not offer Himself to the Father.

With regard to the Revision now before the National Assembly, it was clearly too much for Evangelicals and not enough for Catholics. Evangelicals opposed it as "a concession to disobedience" and "a departure from principle." It was not a Revision but a Reversion. And reversion to type was said to constitute degeneration. Evangelicals of this type showed a strong dislike of the First Reformed Book. It was discounted as being only transitional and tentative, whereas the Second Book was commended as being the deliberate doctrine of the Reformers. The effect of these statements was, however, largely neutralized by the reminder that the Act of Uniformity which authorized the Second Book described the First as "a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church." It was also felt by some that whether the principle that reversion to type constitutes degeneration is true in biology, it is a dangerous argument for those who appeal to primitive precedent in the teaching of Scripture. For that is nothing else than reversion to type. On the Anglo-Catholic side the Revision before the National Assembly was criticized with severity. It was pronounced a mere temporary expedient, founded in compromise. Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics agreed to condemn it.

In behalf of a "centrally minded" School, "neither Protestant nor Anglo-Catholic," it was contended that the Elizabethan Compromise is too strait for us; that there is a clear case for Revision of the Communion Service; but that the proposals before the National Assembly do not provide the required elasticity. It was urged, very firmly and distinctly, that nothing which fails to meet the legitimate requirements of Anglo-Catholics can satisfy the needs of the Church; and that there is nothing in those requirements inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church of England.

It may be safely said that no speech in the whole of the Synod made a greater and more conciliatory impression.

From the Broad Church School came an acknowledgment that in practice Uniformity had ceased to exist. The liberal Churchman pleaded that the solution lay in a variety of use. It was urged that we cannot arrest development at any stage of the process, and that the Reformation was not final. It was recommended on the Broad Church side that the liturgy of 1549 should be made an optional alternative in the interests of order and peace. And a powerful appeal from the same school of thought was made to the Evangelicals to allow the Anglo-Catholic movement free scope, on the ground that the

history of the past was a serious warning against the dangers of attempting suppression.

On the other hand, there were those who viewed with dismay the suggestion of alternative uses. They believed that one Rite could be devised to the satisfaction of every School. What were the lines on which this uniform Rite must proceed the Synod was not told. Nor was any answer given to the Anglo-Catholic plea that a single Rite for the use of both Schools had been tried ever since the Reformation and had failed; that a liturgy so comprehensive as to satisfy both would bear no resemblance to any liturgy in the world, and is not within the wit of man to devise.

From the standpoint of a philosophic student of Religions, the Synod was reminded that the problem before us was not confined to Christianity. It existed in every great Religion. It was the problem how to combine in their due proportion the three great elements in Religion, the institutional, the intellectual, and the mystical. None of these three elements ought to be suppressed or placed in an inferior position. The remedy was not to be found in the amalgam recommended by some speakers, but in the generous acceptance of a diversity of Rites.

A " convinced Evangelical " profoundly admired the work of those from whom he differed, but would like to see the Communion Service left exactly as it is. But there must be an alternative use. And the alternative use must be one which somebody will use. Who was going to use the Service proposed to the National Assembly was certainly not clear. Why not boldly authorize, said the " convinced Evangelical," the Prayer Book of 1549 ?

Long before the time of voting came, the general atmosphere of the Synod made it certain that they would not advocate the principle of Uniformity. The readiness of Evangelicals and liberal Churchmen to advocate variety of use, to recommend the Book of 1549, as an alternative to our existing Service, was most remarkable. It reveals an extraordinary progress, unimaginable only a few years ago.

It will be remarked that when the voting came the Synod declared against retaining our present Communion Service as the only permissible use by a majority of 243; in favour of the alternative before the National Assembly by a majority of 2; and in favour of a variety of liturgies by a majority of 258.

These figures are certainly remarkable. But they require explanation. For no party voted solid. The majority of 243 against retaining our present Communion Service as the only permissible use was composed of liberal Evangelicals and

Broad Churchmen, together with a large number of Anglo-Catholics, who agreed in their vote, though their reasons were different. Liberal Evangelicals felt that the time has come to make concessions. Broad Churchmen voted in the interest of larger comprehensiveness: Anglo-Catholics because they are profoundly dissatisfied with the existing use. But the last named were divided. Some voted with the minority to retain the present Book unchanged, because, in their opinion, the time for a satisfactory revision has not yet come; and they would prefer to endure the imperfections that exist, rather than incur the risk of having another Rite, not much more satisfactory, imposed upon them. If they could have been convinced that a satisfactory revision was obtainable they would have voted with the majority. As things were, they voted the opposite way. Whether it would not have been much better to vote for change, and register a protest later on, if the change was inadequate, is another matter. But it is certain that the number of clergy who are convinced that the age of Uniformity is past is considerably larger than the voting in the Synod revealed. At the same time, there are no doubt a few Anglo-Catholics of strictly conservative tendencies who look wistfully toward the principle of one uniform Rite, and would rather retain and improve the existing one. But they seem to be few.

With regard to the Revised Book now before the National Assembly, carried out by a majority of 2, it is clear that it does not satisfy the needs of the Church. For a Service accepted by 236 clergy and rejected by 234 is beyond all question no solution of our difficulties. It has only separated the clergy of this Diocese into two almost equal divisions. There does not seem the smallest prospect of unity about this particular revision.

And, finally, the huge majority of 258 in favour of allowing a number of different liturgies in the English Church was not, and could not have been, attained by Anglo-Catholics alone. It was the result of a union of opposites. Liberal Evangelicals wanted it, because they are anxious for Reunion with Wesleyans and others, and are convinced that such Reunion will make variety of liturgies inevitable. Broad Churchmen wanted it because they are out for comprehension. The majority is so extraordinarily large, and composed of such various elements, that one can only wonder how the Life and Liberty movement expects to solve the problem by the imposition, if this is indeed its aim, of one solitary use: above all such a use as that which the Bishop of Manchester has recommended.

NOTICES

MATTER, LIFE, MIND, AND GOD. By Professor R. F. A. Hoernlé. Methuen. 6s.

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE. By Professor W. H. Wood. Macmillan. 6s.

Professor Hoernlé's excellent book is described in its Preface as "a discussion of what some of the leading thinkers of our day are saying" about the subjects mentioned in the title. It is more than this, however, for the "metabolism" of a most original mind, acting on modern philosophical theories, has not failed to produce some extremely stimulating thoughts.

Throughout the book there runs an unmistakable insistence on the necessity for a synoptic or synthetic attitude to the views of man about the universe. The first essential is that we should see things whole—or as much so as possible. "He who sees things together is the true philosopher," says Plato once more on the very first page of Professor Hoernlé's book. "The function of philosophy," we read on p. 44, "is to stand for the ideal of 'thinking together,' the whole of human experience; taken as revealing in all its forms—through what we feel and will no less than what we perceive and think—something of the nature of the world we live in." Nothing could be more contrary to this spirit than the assertion still so often made: "The scientific method is the only way of attaining to Truth" with its opposite number: "By mystical experience alone can we make contact with Reality."

In Chapter I. Professor Hoernlé sketches the mutual relations of Science, Religion, and Philosophy, and indicates the part of each one in the formation of the synoptic outlook. In the second chapter he speaks of the antithesis between "matter" and "spirit," and gives an account of the modern views about it. But when he goes on to deal with the nature of Life, as he does in the third chapter, he really excels himself. He has given here a most accurate and readable survey of the tendencies in present-day biological thought, without unduly stressing any outlook in a "Gebiet" where so many opposing ones are tenable. "The real problem in biological philosophy," he says, "is essentially synoptic, demanding a concept of living beings which shall be plastic enough to fit their manifold kinds and the diversity of their dealings . . . a concept which has room within itself for the physico-chemical basis of life at one end and for feeling and intelligence at the other." Very little is omitted; Haldane, Henderson, Loeb, and Driesch, all come in for critical consideration, and the position is summed up in a manner most just and clear. By an imperceptible transition the fifth chapter is occupied with the problem of the relations of mind with body, and here again the treatment could hardly be bettered. Nor is it worse when finally Professor Hoernlé goes on to examine Religion. While he would probably be prepared to say that there can be a science of religion in the sense that religious phenomena can be classified and oriented by the scientific method, yet he emphatically declares that "the one thing philosophy ought not to do, is to estimate or rank religion by a non-religious standard." In other words, "the philosopher who sets out to discuss religion must himself be religious."

Not the least valuable thing in the book is the extensive bibliography

appended to each chapter, and its accompanying evaluation of the books mentioned in each case. This should be most useful to those who can only spare little time from experimental or other work for the consideration of more fundamental problems.

Professor Hoernlé has produced an excellent book—sane, thoughtful, creative. All laboratory workers intent solely on technique and the immediate theories of natural science, and all students of theology whose minds run on traditional and "dogmatic" lines, should be made by law to read Professor Hoernlé's book!

Professor Wood's book is of a very different type. The author's ideas are cloaked by a remarkable obscurity of style, and when this is successfully penetrated, the meaning of some of his statements still remains far from clear—*e.g.*, on p. 101 we have: "Evolution is the scientist as philosopher or theologian."

For the first quarter of the book the author formulates in considerable detail a "Religion of Science" which he appears to believe is held by the majority of modern scientific men. This religion dispenses with the idea of God, and consists, *inter alia*, of a belief in such diverse things as the Laws of Thermodynamics, the all-sufficiency of the scientific method, the "theory of evolution," and Eugenics. Having erected this man of straw, Professor Wood devotes the remaining 140 pages of his book to knocking him down and trampling on him, so that if anyone had been sufficiently foolish to accept the "Religion of Science" at the beginning, he would be left at the end thoroughly disillusioned. Occasionally Professor Wood lapses into Theosophical ecstasies, as on p. 25: "The Original Form was doubtless 'infinite nebulæ' or 'atoms, each consisting of a spherical nucleus of positive electrification, and groups of corpuscles,' or as God-substance."

If Professor Wood had avoided this habit, clarified his style, and written on more constructive lines, he might have produced a more useful contribution to a literature already, alas! quite well stocked with unhelpful books.

N. J. T. M. Needham, O.G.S.

The Christian Revolution. By Henry T. Hodgkin, M.A., M.B. (Cantab.). The Swarthmore Press, 1923. Pp. 316. 7s. 6d. net.

The way of Revolution is contrasted by the author of this book with the way of gradual Reform. In theory, the adherents of Reform "concentrate their attention on the slow process by which little by little moral gain has been achieved," and slow progress is all they can expect. They attack the abuses of the present system of things, but the system itself they let alone—"they defend capitalism, they defend war."

The "Christian revolutionary" takes the contrary line. He opposes the whole system and the system as a whole, not by methods of violence, but by those of peaceful persuasion, propaganda, private association, and, when needed, passive resistance. All the progress that has been made from the time of the monk Telemachus onwards has been due in the main to the efforts of men who have "lived dangerously" and have taken "experiment" and "adventure" for their battle-cries.

It is a recommendation of the book to say that it makes its readers uncomfortable. We may criticize its principles, but in doing so we have an uneasy feeling that the people who hold them are better than ourselves. The revolutionary will not use force, but he has no guarantee that force

will not be used against himself. He risks, to say the least, popularity, possessions, and position. There is a subtle danger of our opposing his theories because we should not dare to act on them.

Written as it is with an admirable style and temper, the main contentions of the book seem unconvincing.

In the first place, it assumes too easily that the present system is fundamentally vicious. We are not compromising our faith if we hold that the vocation to poverty is a special vocation, and that the pursuit of wealth is a motive implanted in the mind by God, and one that makes, on the whole, for social progress. The example of the Quaker community which refused to take any military measures of self-defence against the surrounding Red Indian peril, is not conclusive evidence against the need of police to guard against burglars, or of soldiers to prevent a new Chaka wiping out his white or black neighbours in South Africa.

Again, on this revolutionary theory it is (and, presumably, always has been) God's will (*a*) that the ideal Kingdom should be realized *soon;* (*b*) that its realization is contingent on human effort; and (*c*) that man's lack of effort is the cause of its delay.

But the theory lands us in a hundred difficulties of which the writer takes little notice. It implies, for instance, that it was God's will to convert the world in the first century of our era, and by the agency of the early Christians; also that its non-conversion was their fault. But it was certainly not their fault that half the world was still undiscovered, and until it was discovered it could hardly be converted. Again, if it was God's will that there should be a very long preparation before the Incarnation, it may be His will that there should be another long preparation before the Kingdom of Christ is universally accepted.

There is a form of piety, represented in the "Christian Revolution" Series (to which Dr. Hodgkin's book belongs), that seems in danger of being at once too temerarious and too complacent, not indeed about its own achievements, but about its views as to how and when God means to carry out His purposes, and about the extent to which He depends on conscious human co-operation.

ALFRED D. KELLY.

GOOD MEN WITHOUT FAITH. By the Bishop of Norwich. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

Bishop Gore, in an extract quoted at the beginning of this book, calls attention to the fact that it is a common thing for us "to find the genuinely Christian character where intellectually there is nothing but doubt and even denial." This fact, the goodness of non-believers, raises several distinct problems. Dr. Pollock deals with one of them, and not, perhaps, as we shall see, with the one which is of the most interest. He states it as follows: "We find in the world about us so much that is good in individuals to whom we seem unable with any degree of accuracy to attribute the name of Christians, and we often ask ourselves *from what source* [italics ours] all this goodness comes." Dr. Pollock's answer to this question is supported by a scholarly discussion of relevant passages from the New Testament, set out with an admirable simplicity. We must confine ourselves to a bare summary of the conclusions at which he arrives. He draws a contrast "between the light as it came and comes from the pre-Incarnate Word and the light mediated for Christians by

the Holy Spirit." Seeing, however, that the Incarnation has taken place, to speak of the light as (still) coming from the pre-Incarnate Word seems inaccurate or even self-contradictory. Yet the Bishop's meaning is clear enough, as the next sentence shows: "The preface of St. John's Gospel leads us to believe that God illuminated the heart of men, of every man, by the operations of the Word before the Incarnation, [and] that this action of the Word still continues among" non-believers. It comes to this: Non-believers cannot be related (in the way that Christians are) to the Incarnate Word given through the Holy Spirit, yet they do receive light through the Incarnate Word just as they did before the Incarnation had taken place. And this light is the source of their goodness.

The question, then, with which the Bishop began, is answered; but another problem, more widely and deeply felt, remains.

It is suggested by a story told of St. Francis Xavier when he was puzzled and a little perturbed by the virtues of the Japanese. He complained, not, one suspects, without a touch of humour, that it must have been the devil who made the heathen so good in order to tempt us to doubt the advantage of being Christians. Xavier's difficulty is still felt acutely. Why, we ask, is the goodness of the non-believer so often on a level with the goodness of the Christian? Bishop Pollock's conclusion that Christian goodness has a higher and richer source than heathen goodness makes this problem harder than it was before.

Various solutions may be suggested. We may deny that the morality of the non-believer is on the level with that of the Christian. It shows, for instance, less evidence of missionary zeal. "Secular Sunday Schools" exist on a small scale; a "Secular Board of Missions" has still to be established. Again, non-Christian ethics show a strong tendency to lay stress on self-regarding motives—on "self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control"—"which three alone make man the perfect prig," as Chesterton remarks; at any rate, they are in strong contrast with the self-forgetfulness, the faith, and the humility which Christian ethics have as their centre and foundation. But to work these points out would require a treatise.

Dr. Pollock has the right to limit his subject at his own discretion, but one could wish that at some future time he would supplement the present book by another bearing on the form of the problem to which we have just called attention.

A. D. Kelly.

Fifty Years of Disestablishment. A Sketch. By H. E. Patton, B.D., Archdeacon of Killaloe. S.P.C.K. 5s.

The fifty years of which this sketch treats have had their share of troubles for Ireland, troubles which are in no wise ended yet. It was no easy task that Archdeacon Patton set before him when he started to write of them. He modestly terms his work a "Sketch." It is not history in the strict sense of the word. So written the appeal would have been to the few. The book we now have is written for the many, and is eminently readable. As the Archbishop of Armagh hints in a Foreword, it was right that it should so be a "human document," and also "written while the memory of the things was still fresh."

In spite of the difficulty of condensing much matter into a brief space, Archdeacon Patton has done his work well. There is not much detailed

account of the various political, agrarian, or even of the ecclesiastical troubles of these fifty years, though all are naturally touched on.

Every Irish Churchman, every Irishman, everyone interested in the affairs, religious or other, of Ireland will do well to read this book. The circumstances connected with Disestablishment itself, the "Revision" Debates, the discussions about the Consecration of Bishop Cabrera, the abandoned Derry Church Conference, and the more recent discussions about the Trinity College Divinity School, are all set forth here by the author's ready pen. We have pen sketches, too, of most of those who have worked for the Church of Ireland during the time—Dr. Salmon, Dean Dickinson, the Greggs, Archbishops Alexander and Plunket, Lord Justice Fitzgibbon—not to mention those who are still with us.

The book has been well produced by the Dublin University Press, and the illustrations (chiefly portraits) are excellent.

There are several useful appendixes, the work, for the most part, of other pens. The first, by the Bishop of Kilmore, gives a clear account of the little understood, and often misrepresented, financial arrangements made at the time of the Disestablishment. J. M. HARDEN.

ENGLISH SECTS. By Arthur Reynolds. Mowbray and Co. 3s. 6d. net.

The arrangement in Mr. Reynolds' book is alphabetical. Thus Adventists come first, and Unitarians last.

These two are, perhaps, sufficiently removed from one another to justify the plan; otherwise it is not the order we should have expected in "an Historical Handbook." There is a great deal of information about the "sects" to be found here, but the book is not written from a sympathetic point of view.

We may believe the last part of the following paragraph to be true, but most of us would have wished to see the whole of it very differently expressed:

"Unitarians maintain that they are the only true Protestants, from which it would follow that no believer in the deity of Christ can be a true Protestant. However that may be, their claim to call themselves a Christian community cannot be acknowledged. For the supreme test for all who profess and call themselves Christians is their answer to the question, Do you believe *ex animo* that the Eternal Son is Very God of Very God?" (p. 222).

Spiritualism, as a cult in itself, is not too harshly dealt with; the chapter on Christian Scientists gives a fair opportunity of judging the quality of Mrs. Eddy's teaching; to us, one of the most interesting sections in the book is that which accounts for the elaborate ritual practised by the "Catholic Apostolic Church," otherwise known as "Irvingites" (pp. 24-26).

The Methodists have considerably more pages allotted to them than any of the other bodies, as their numbers deserve; but this fact seems to be due, mostly, to their many divisions in the past, and to their very complicated organization.

We commend *English Sects* as a serviceable little volume to have on our shelves, provided we read it sufficiently *cum grano*, and test it from larger sources. The "Survey" at the end is a good survey, and is in a much happier vein than the paragraph which has been (perhaps rather unfairly) selected for quotation. T. W. LITTLE.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. By H. G. Jameson. Blackwell. 6s. net.

The author maintains the theory that Mark is an abbreviation of Matthew. Luke, supposing that Mark represented St. Peter's and therefore, presumably, a superior version of the events, took Mark as his basis. But he made large extracts from the non-Marcan sections of Matthew—those sections, namely, which critics in general suppose to be derived from Q—and inserted them, along with matter from other sources, in great blocks in the Marcan outline. The minor verbal agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, where all three are parallel, are explained by the fact that Luke, though mainly dependent on Mark in these passages, is also influenced by reminiscences of Matthew.

The theory is argued with very considerable ingenuity, and will sound quite plausible to people who have not carefully studied the parallel passages in the Gospels and considered the significance of the enormous mass of minute indications that Mark is the source of Matthew collected and analysed in Sir John Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ*. To anyone who has really looked into the minutiæ of the subject the objection to the theory outlined above is simply that it makes the procedure attributed to Mark and Luke that of a lunatic or a crank. Thus we are told that Mark "abbreviates" Matthew. But an abbreviator presumably wishes to save space, but a glance at a Synopsis of the Gospels shows that, wherever Matthew and Mark are exactly parallel, Mark is always the longer of the two; but the additional length arises in the main from purely verbal redundancy, or less frequently through the addition of quite unimportant details. A person who abbreviated Matthew by the excision of the Sermon on the Mount and most of the Parables in order to make room for this kind of thing could hardly have been sane—and it would require a good deal of evidence to reconcile the writer of this review to such a conception of the Evangelist. On the other hand, if Matthew was using Mark, everything is quite natural. Matthew "abbreviates" Mark by compressing his redundant style and by omitting unimportant details, and thus gains space for the insertion of vitally important and interesting material from other sources.

Again, the contexts in which Q material appears in Matthew are always most appropriate; in Luke they have rarely any particular connection with what goes before or after. If both Matthew and Luke got this material from a now lost source, Q, this is explicable. If, however, Luke derived these passages from Matthew, he has taken them from appropriate contexts in order to insert them in contexts which have no special appropriateness, and which *ex hypothesi* were not the occasions on which, as a matter of historical fact, these particular sayings were spoken. Luke also, then, on this theory, is a perverse crank. It would seem preferable to think the theory incorrect.

B. H. STREETER.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.